

Cross (Jas. C.)

ANALYSIS AND REFUTATION

OF THE

“STATEMENTS OF FACTS

IN RELATION TO THE

EXPULSION OF JAMES C. CROSS

FROM TRANSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY.”

RECENTLY PUBLISHED BY DUDLEY, MITCHELL, AND PETER.

BY JAMES CONQUEST CROSS, M. D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF MATERIA MEDICA AND THERAPEUTICS IN THE MEDICAL COLLEGE
OF OHIO; LATE PROFESSOR OF THE INSTITUTES OF MEDICINE AND MEDICAL
JURISPRUDENCE IN THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF TRANSYLVANIA
UNIVERSITY; AND AT PRESENT PROFESSOR OF THE
SAME IN THE MEMPHIS MEDICAL COLLEGE.

Bart

LIBRARY
4-29495
Washington
LOUISVILLE.

PRENTICE AND WEISSINGER.

1846.

ANALYSIS AND REFUTATION.

As was expected, when I published my *appeal*, I have not been permitted to remain silent. Nor did I, as I then remarked, particularly desire it. But Dr. Dudley has disappointed me, not in the instruments he has employed to conduct his vindication, for with these I was familiar, but in the spirit and the manner in which he has suffered it to be done. I did suppose a regard for the public taste and common decency, if he had no respect for himself, would have made him exact from his subordinates at least a vulgar observance of the ordinary courtesies of written controversy. Of these he has shown himself to be ignorant as well as totally insensible of the disgust which the coarseness of his conduct must inspire in every mind in which there is an idea of taste, a sentiment of pride, or a sense of honor. An example in illustration and proof of the truth of this, the reader has doubtless seen in the *card* of W. A. Dudley, the son of Dr. B. W. Dudley, which was spoken of in the following terms by a writer in a Tennessee Journal: "The hero of the billingsgate advertisement in your paper is a son of the professor; and, from the free and easy command he possesses of abusive epithets one is almost compelled to believe that a part, at least, of his education has been acquired at the 'Five Points,' or some other notorious school of scurrility and degradation. In the instance before us the defamer has so far overshot the mark of decency and propriety with his overloaded weapon, that the rebound has done more execution than the discharge—more injury has been sustained behind the breech than before the muzzle."

The only notice I took of the card alluded to is to be found in the subjoined address to the public, which was made more for the purpose of stating the fact that W. A. Dudley is the son of—and not B. W. Dudley himself—than any thing else:

TO THE PUBLIC.

Mr. W. A. Dudley, the son of Dr. B. W. Dudley, published a Card in the *Observer and Reporter*, of August 15th, full of abuse of myself. In my "Appeal to the Medical Profession of the United States," I refrained from any attack upon the moral character of Dr. Dudley,

except so far as the facts connected with his management of the Medical School compelled me to state. Should I now notice it, the *Public*, I know, will hold me excused. Those who have read or may read my *Appeal*, will be persuaded, I am sure, that no notice of it at all is required at my hands. My well established facts cannot be met by abusive epithets without proof. I am yet on the vantage ground, and until it is seen whether my character is to be formally attacked, I shall remain quiet. At present, as a direct answer to that Card, I say, that no act of mine shall deprive me of an opportunity of presenting Dr. B. W. Dudley in his true colors, as he has never been presented before. The first thing for me to do, should I hereafter be compelled to have any thing to do with this man, will be to write his life.

JAMES C. CROSS.

AUGUST 15, 1846.

This Card was misinterpreted, for many came to the unauthorised conclusion that it was my last word, and designed as a termination of the controversy. This idea was hastily seized upon by the friends of Dr. Dudley, and the opinion industriously propagated that I had, to use their own language, "backed out." This was what was wished by Dr. Dudley, and those with whom he is associated, for the following paragraph which heads the Card of his son gives the public the fullest assurance that nothing more need be expected from them: "The following Card which appeared in the 'Lexington Observer and Reporter,' of August 15th, is the only reply which it is thought necessary to make to the scurilous pamphlet lately issued by James C. Cross."

This information, however, the reader must understand did not herald the Card when it originally appeared in the *Lexington Observer and Reporter*, of the 15th ultimo. A very large edition of this "only reply," some say five thousand copies, was afterwards printed on *letter-sheets*, and circulated throughout the Valley of the Mississippi. Although I had early intelligence of this fact, my friends were unable to procure a copy of it for me, and I only obtained possession of it, at last, through the kindness of a friend in Memphis who enclosed it to me in a letter of which the following is an extract: "You may rest assured that nothing

4

emanating from the Transylvania clique will have the effect of injuring you with your colleagues here, or with the profession at large."

TO THE PUBLIC.

It is with regret I find that I am again constrained to address the public. In the discharge of this duty, I shall endeavor not to offend or disgust the reader by the lowness and vulgarity of my language, or the empty ridiculousness of my assertions. Immediately after the appearance, in the *Lexington Observer and Reporter*, of the 15th inst., of a Card, signed W. A. Dudley, in which my character was most foully and slanderously denounced, I said, in a Card of the same date, "until it is seen whether my character is to be formally attacked, I shall remain quiet." This declaration was made because it had been repeatedly and boldly asserted by the friends of Dr. Benj. W. Dudley, while my *Appeal* was in press, that a publication was being prepared, in which, it was said, my life and character would be exhibited in the blackest colors; I therefore considered myself bound to wait a reasonable length of time before speaking more fully on the subject than I had in my Card of the 15th inst., which was designed not as an answer to W. A. Dudley, but to say to the public why I did not notice him.

My position in relation to Dr. Benj. W. Dudley, was clearly defined in my "*Appeal to the Medical Profession of the United States*," in which I say, at page 29: "Having now laid before the reader a broad and inexpugnable phalanx of facts which go irresistibly to establish the position that a conspiracy was formed for my destruction, of which Dr. Dudley was the leader, I will not insult his understanding or offend his sensibilities, by indulging in vulgar and vituperative comments upon the conduct of those who banded together for my ruin, and that too, for no other reason, than because I had resolved no longer to be associated with such men. But I must remark, in closing, that taking it for granted that I shall not be suffered, nor do I particularly desire it, much as I am disposed to court peace with all mankind, to remain silent in future, those to whom this *Appeal* is addressed, must distinctly understand that I 'fight not with small or great, save only with the King of Israel'—and that with Dr. Dudley I am ready to arrange all points of difficulty or difference. With his understrappers I cannot and will not have any thing to do."

That the public, and especially the distant public, who would not in all probability see my *Appeal*, might know why I did not condescend to notice the tissue of lies set forth against me by W. A. Dudley, the son of Dr. B. W. Dudley, I published the Card already alluded to, and for the reason assigned, determined to give time for the publication of the formal attack which was threatened. This delay, I considered it decent and proper to observe, for although I had the full moral conviction that Dr. B. W. Dudley had too great a regard for his own character to suffer any such attack to be made upon me, and thus give me a full *justification* in the eyes of the world, and of the people of this city, whose favor is the

"breath of his nostrils," to exhibit him to the public gaze in his true moral attitude, I could not altogether discredit the boldly repeated assertions of his friends in relation to the alleged forthcoming publication. No publication has been made, and if the assertions of the friends of Dr. B. W. Dudley are now to be believed, none need be expected.

Perhaps the matter would have ended with my Card of the 15th instant, but for a fresh exhibition of the duplicity and deceit of Dr. B. W. Dudley. To escape the odium, which must necessarily attach to the father of a son, who, under existing circumstances, could write and publish a Card, containing allegations which the whole city knows to be gratuitous and unfounded, the friends of Dr. B. W. Dudley, asserted, immediately upon its appearance, that it was done without his knowledge or consent, and that he regretted and repudiated it. No one believed this, and the fact now become notorious, that the infamous Card of W. A. Dudley, has been printed on *letter-sheets*, and extensively circulated, proves conclusively, that it is endorsed by Dr. B. W. Dudley, and that it is his final answer to my appeal. In this view of the case, I demand the publication of their pamphlet, and challenge Dr. B. W. Dudley to the proof of a single allegation brought against me by his son. Amongst these charges, are those of Seduction and Adultery. The hardihood and impudent audacity of these allegations, coming from such a source, have excited the wonder and amazement of hundreds—charges, especially the latter, of which he has been so notoriously guilty, that his name has become a by-word amongst the citizens of Lexington, when they would signalize those who have become scandalously celebrated for their amours, but at the same time, remarkably cunning in concealing them. To dwell upon such a subject, is not only disagreeable but disgusting, and the public taste must be excessively vitiated, if it should be encouraged or even tolerated. For this reason, and in mercy to those who must suffer in such a controversy as this is likely to become, I shall refrain, for the present, from making specifications or adducing proof. To the commission of such an outrage upon public decency, no less cause can provoke me, than the attempt on the part of Dr. B. W. Dudley to establish by proof, charges which he has suffered his son, in a fit of desperation, to prefer against me, but which he knows to be false. If he wishes to become as infamous abroad, as he is notorious at home, for the perpetration of every sensual iniquity, he has now an opportunity. In the meantime, the public should bear in mind what I have already proved against him by facts that cannot be undermined, counteracted or destroyed.

JAMES C. CROSS.
LEXINGTON, August 28, 1846.

This Card produced an impression in Lexington, at which I was not only pleased but in every respect entirely satisfied. It made my position one of triumphant vindication, from the wrongs and outrages I had suffered at the hands of Dr. Dudley, unless he should furnish the public with satisfactory proof of the moral

delinquencies which he had suffered, and I have no doubt authorized, his son publicly to prefer against me, and which he fully endorsed when he caused the *Card* embodying them, to be printed on *letter-sheets* and circulated through the Post-Office. No one believed that he or his subordinates would think of entering upon so hopeless an enterprise, and the opinion spread abroad that the controversy had closed. In this view of the matter I had no confidence. Silence on his part I had rendered utterly impossible. He must either speak or be forever disgraced in public estimation, as a malignant calumniator and slanderer, as one who ferociously started his son upon a most rufianly enterprise, and when called to account, instead of adducing proof, like the divers in the gulf of Ormus, who when they see fish approaching to devour them, destroy the transparency of the water by raising the mud with their feet, he endeavors to humbug the public with vague and unintelligible generalities.

He knew he must speak or be lost, and the agonizing thought goaded him in every fibre of his heart. His position, even in his Paradise, *so rich in all the enjoyments in which he so much delights*, began to be precarious.—When he saw that his sycophancy and his suppers ceased to be invested with their usual attractions, he was convinced that, without a struggle, he must sink at once and forever, to the very bottom of the great ocean of public contempt; and “Contempt,” says Dr. Johnson “is a kind of gangrene which when it seizes, one part of a character corrupts all the rest by degrees.” My last *Card*, together with such notices of my appeal, as the following, which appeared in the *Knoxville Standard*, produced this conviction and forced him to break a silence which he had obstinately persisted in, amidst the fiercest and most deadly assaults upon his conduct and character, for more than thirty years*

“PROFESSOR CROSS.”

The history of talent and genius in all time is more or less marked by the malevolence of inferior beings whom circumstances, aided by the trickery of bad hearts, have elevated to an undue and dangerous position among men.

The consciousness of inferiority, together with that rancorous envy which holds the place in corrupt minds of generosity and admiration, impels them to detract and defame those whom the God of Nature has placed higher in the intellectual and moral scale than themselves, and whom they cannot rival they attempt to destroy. There is nothing so dangerous to the purity and health of the moral and social constitution as the elevation to places of trust and honor of beings without ability, integrity and firmness. Not capable of brilliantly acquitting themselves in their foreign position, and unable to reach the proud summit of superiority, they use all the means within their control to drag down its natural occupants to their own unenviable level. The history of the period of the Professorship of Dr. Cross in Transylvania, shows an unbroken series of duplicity and wrong, directed against himself, scarcely paralleled in the records of chicanery. Placed as he was in juxtaposition with those who lack the moral firmness to dare be honest men, and under the despotic sway of one who, if judged by his conduct as detailed in the appeal of Dr. Cross, views subserviency and pliancy as essential attributes in his colleagues, determined in their sapient conclave not only upon the removal of Dr. Cross out of their iniquitous road, but his utter demolition. Their vile machinations resulted in the withdrawal of a man who was an ornament to old Transylvania.

Upon the arrival of the proper time, Dr. Cross published an “Appeal to the Medical Profession of the United States,” in which he gives a full and candid narrative of all the circumstances and events that led to his resignation. Written in a clear, bold and manly style, it carries the conviction to every candid mind that it is *the truth*, and while it stamps its author as a man of unusual ability, it shows him to be magnanimous to even his deadliest foe, for while he pours a burning torrent of invective on the devoted heads of his writhing victims, he waives all the doubtful advantages which the usage and custom of written warfare would tolerate, and confines himself to plain, honest conclusions drawn from fairly stated facts. He measures the foils, gives the longest to his foe, and then vanquishes him in a manner that does credit to his head and heart. Every lover of truth should read this work, as it discloses a system of villainy and duplicity in high places which would shame depravity itself, and visits on the heads of the guilty an awful but just retribution.

Though not a member of the medical profession and feeling no bias on the subject, yet I rejoice in the triumph of right over wrong, and believe that every true-hearted man will arise from the perusal of the “Appeal” with the conviction that moral obliquity never received a more just or manly exposure.”

G.

*Happy would it have been for Dr. Dudley had he continued to pursue his usual and heretofore successful policy. His obliging me to respond to the frantic calumnies of a venal confederacy, he shall repent to the last hour of his existence, for had I been sitting at the elbows of and dictating to the *Trio*, the “Statements of Facts” would not have been made more vulnerable nor would they have answered my purpose better. So low-bred is the idle gossip and so frivolous and absurd are the calumnies which the *Trio* have uttered and published, that the reflecting part of the public can scarcely fail to ask the question, are these men responsible agents? So closely is what they have said akin to the unquestionable offspring of insanity, that it will hardly be permitted to claim any other paternity, and if the Board of Trustees would act sensibly, in future, they will take the advice Hamlet gave Ophelia, which was to lock her father up, that he might play the fool no where but in his own house. I would therefore, and it cannot, at least, by those who have read the “Statements,” be looked upon as a gratuitous recommendation counsel, them to close the doors of the College upon the *Trio*, that they may be allowed to render themselves ridiculous nowhere but upon the rostrum, and for the amusement of the students exclusively. Indeed, nearly the whole of what they have asserted is as false as dicer's oaths, as I shall conclusively prove, for they have done little more than to

Jumble together an undigested heap of contrarieties, disgraceful both to their heads and hearts, which will oblige me to commit moral when in fact it should be physical murder, for they deserve the fate of poor Cinna the poet, who was killed by Mark Antony's mob for making bad verses.

The "Statements of Facts" in relation to what Mitchell, Peter and Dr. Dudley, slanderously denominate my *expulsion* from the Medical Department of Transylvania University, as I expected, at last appeared; but under circumstances calculated to throw the greatest discredit upon the work. Now, it is a fact, that more than ten days before I obtained a copy of it, during which time the public believed the controversy had ceased, I learned from a friend, that it was being printed, but could not ascertain by whom or where. Of the "Statements of Facts," an edition of four thousand copies has been printed—one thousand of which was mailed at least a week before I could obtain a sight of it. This silence and secrecy are conclusive proof that the authors of the *Statements* are convinced that what they have asserted, for they have not attempted to prove any thing, will not bear a sifting examination, but they were encouraged with the hope that, as I would soon have to leave Lexington, they would be able to keep me ignorant of its existence until so late a period that it would not be in my power to give them the licking and flogging which the miscreants know they so richly deserve. So effectually did they conceal their operations, that I have no doubt at this very moment (Sept. 12.) there are persons six hundred miles from this place reading their "Statements," and yet a gentleman informed me to-day that it was impossible for him to obtain a copy of it. This cowardly mode of seeking revenge or of answering what they impudently call calumnies, should not only in the estimation of every candid and just man discredit the "Statements," but should disgrace their authors. Nor is this all. Doubtless for the purpose of lulling me into a feeling of security, the following paragraph, of unequivocal import, was inserted in the Editorial department of the *Western Lancet*, for September. The reader should know that both of those works were printed in the same office. The editor of the *Western Lancet* says:—"Efforts from time to time have been made to detract from the well earned reputation of this school; (Trans. Med. School,) but instead of entering into acrimonious controversy, and attempting to refute every idle rumor that may be circulated, the Faculty deem it more consistent with their duty to themselves and the profession, to devote their energies to the improvement of the departments committed to their care, and to the faithful instructions of those pupils who may attend the lectures." This declaration of Professor Lawson has been appealed to as conclusive proof that no further response to my *Appeal* need be expected, and that no notice whatever would be taken of my *Card* of the 28th of August. These notions I have no doubt, were

propogated by the unscrupulous *Trio* for the purpose of impressing me with the belief that I need not trouble myself any further on the subject, and I am only sorry to think that Professor Lawson would even wink at such duplicity. Immediately after the perusal of the "Statements," I issued the following Card:—

TO THE PUBLIC.

A pamphlet has been sent through the post-office, to the physicians of the South and West, entitled "Statements of Facts in Relation to the Expulsion of James C. Cross," for at least a week past, of which I could not get possession until to-day, and then only through the kindness of a friend, who, somehow or other, procured a copy and sent it to me. I applied to Mr. Moore, the binder, for a copy, in the presence of witnesses, which he refused, stating that he had received positive orders not to suffer one to go out of his office. Here, then, these men, Mitchell, Peter,* and Dr. Dudley, who would have the world believe they have a right to be regarded as honest and honorable, have been secretly circulating, to my injury, what they know to be the most infamous falsehoods—falsehoods of which perfidious villains would have been ashamed. Their "Statements of Facts," &c., consist of nothing but the simple assertion of the most impudent and graceless lies that men who would be regarded as respectable, ever uttered, and this Bulletin is now issued for no other purpose, than to desire the public to suspend its judgment until the second edition of my "Appeal to the Medical Profession of the United States," ready for the press, appears, and which has been delayed only that I might be made acquainted with the contents of the pamphlet, which I have forced them to publish, after declaring at the head of the Card of W. A. Dudley, which B. W. Dudley has often and emphatically repudiated, but which they have circulated through the whole West and South, that "The following Card, which appeared in the 'Lexington Observer and Reporter,' of August 15th, is the only reply which it is thought necessary to make to the scurrilous pamphlet lately issued by James C. Cross."

In the second edition of my "Appeal," which in a few days will appear, I shall embody a notice of the "Statements of Facts," &c., by Dudley, Mitchell and Peter, and if I do not make Lexington utterly ashamed of them by documentary evidence, the truth of which they themselves will not dare to doubt or deny, I will agree never again to vindicate the truth, or refute a falsehood. If there is power in truth, or justice in Lexington, I pledge myself to overwhelm the infamous trio, *not by assertion, but by proof*, with confusion and redemptionless disgrace.

"Those whom the Gods intend to destroy, they first make mad."

JAMES C. CROSS.

LEXINGTON, Sept. 10, 1846.

*The public will excuse this unceremonious use of the names of those men—their conduct sanctions any violation of the conventionalities of courtesy—from vulgar intellects nothing can be expected but vulgar villains.

In my *Card* of the 28th August, I say: "In this view of the case, I demand the publication of their pamphlet, and challenge Dr. B. W. Dudley to the proof of a single allegation brought against me by his son." In the letter of the 25th of May, 1844, signed by Mitchell, Peter, Drs. Dudley and Richardson, I am told that circumstances relative to my private character induced them to request me to resign. In my *Appeal* I have conclusively proved, if it is proper to speak thus of any proposition insusceptible of mathematical demonstration, that this was a weak and most unprincipled subterfuge—a shallow but inhuman and cruel pretext for the commission of a most foul and unmanly outrage. But this so far from having had the effect to impress him with the atrocity of the deed—of which he had been, if not the author, at least a principal participator, only hardened a heart "full of blackest thoughts," for in a transport of vindictive passion he authorised his son to prefer against me a series of perfectly gratuitous but excessively injurious charges, all having a direct reference to my private character. In my *card* of the 28th of August, I challenged him to the proof of a single one of them. The issue was thus clearly and fairly made up, the question and the only question was the truth of the allegations that had been brought against me. He, with his three subordinates, having most cruelly assaulted my character, and he himself having repeated the assault through his son, every candid and honest man will say that he should either have made a free and full recantation, or have freed his character from the imputation of being a heartless calumniator by an attempt to establish by proof what had been asserted of me.* Neither of these alternatives has he thought proper to adopt, consequently I feel justified in asserting that he knows not how to make any better use of his own offensively rotten moral character, than to wield it for the oppression, and, if possible, the destruction of those who, would hate themselves with a deep and sovereign hatred if they could be made, by either fear or affection, to fawn on and flatter a man who has been for more than thirty

years a plague-spot upon society. Having made me the object of the most abusive and provoking insults, and his crafty and perfidious spirit having lured him from the adoption of a candid, liberal, or an enlightened course, every ingenious and undebauched mind will say that such conduct would

"Have torn the sword from a craven's scabbard," and will fully justify me in the eyes of the world for any severity I may think proper to employ in order to exhibit this Janus-faced cheat in such a light that all may know and understand him.

These preliminary remarks having been made, I propose now to enter upon an analysis of the "*Statements of Facts*" of which Mitchell, Peter, and Dr. Dudley are the authors. This, I will do in a spirit of fairness and candor without offending, if possible, the public taste, but with a severity that must make the most hardened ruffianism feel. Although they have filled their "*Statements*" with the most impudent, empty, and rancorous of assertions that ever emanated from weak heads, or were ever sanctioned by incurably depraved hearts, I will respond to them with facts that cannot be denied or invalidated, that will, while they free me from the imputations with which they hoped to sully, if not destroy, my character, confound them with astonishment and overwhelm them with disgrace. They may possibly

"Beat me to dust, I care not
In such a cause as this, I'll die as a martyr."

The first sentence of the preface contains an admission which must prove fatal to the credibility of the "*Statements*" in the estimation of every man of sense. Indeed it is a disclosure of so thoughtless a character that, I cannot deny myself the pleasure of reminding the *Trio* that I told Mitchell in my *Appeal* that "not only are the base and perfidious, false and treacherous in all their relations with men, but God has so arranged it for wise and good purposes that they shall not be faithful even to their own villainies." The authors of the "*Statements*," conscious that they were going to give publicity to the grossest falsehoods which it was hardly possible could command

*One of the trio asserts that I, "better than any one else, knew that to have stood an investigation before the Board of Trustees would have utterly destroyed me, and have made *matters of history and record* what another one says is already history." If there is any truth in these declarations surely it could not have been difficult to adduce such proof as would have removed all doubt from the minds of the most incredulous—have justified them in the judgment of all for having invited me to resign, and have at once ended this controversy. Dr. Dudley was challenged to the task but declined it, while his cringing and contemptible associates have attempted it no further than to indulge in such vague unsupported assertions as prove that they are calumniators, and that they are conscious the judicious part of mankind will think so. It is impossible to believe that men who have shown themselves capable of every excess of scoundrelish malignity, would have hesitated, the mo-

ment they ascertained that I would no longer continue associated with them, to give to the public the proof that would have "utterly destroyed" me had it been in their power. They know it is much easier to conjure up in the public mind cruel suspicions, that have not the least foundation in fact, than to succeed in establishing a proposition by adequate evidence, although there may be many plausible probabilities in its favor. This is all that Dr. Dudley and his accomplices in crime expect or hope to accomplish, for having been reduced to a state of reckless desperation, they are willing that sensible people should denounce them as scoundrels, if they can, by a stale and shallow trick, but induce weak men and silly women to propagate their calumnies, whether they are believed by them or not. It is upon the ignorance and credulity of such people that Dr. Dudley acts, and it is with such instruments that he has heretofore accomplished his purposes.

belief, even with unsuspicious and credulous men, were simple enough to imagine that they would give plausibility to and even strengthen their testimony, by making the following declaration: "It is proper to apprise the reader, that the following statements of facts were audibly read in the hearing of the persons whose signatures they bear, and approved by all, as setting forth the true state of the case." This was absolutely necessary, for as they were going to give a false version of facts, a careful comparison of notes was indispensable, otherwise the glaring contradictions of which they would necessarily have been guilty, would have rendered any refutation of their statements, on my part, a work of supererogation. When lawyers suspect concert or collusion amongst witnesses they are examined separately, and not in the presence of one another. Had they have read Starkie on *Evidence*, they would not, it is probable, have been betrayed into the commission of so egregious a blunder. But they do not read much, and what is more unfortunate, understand but little, should it be above the comprehension of a dull school boy, of what they do read. Had they read the work to which I have referred they would have discovered the useful fact that a perfect correspondence in the evidence of a number of witnesses in regard to petty and unimportant details, tends to invalidate and destroy rather than establish the truth of their testimony. When the *Trio* consented to engage in so unprincipled an enterprise they should undoubtedly have compared notes to exclude the possibility of a contradiction, but they should not so indiscreetly have betrayed to the public the precaution they had taken. After committing a blunder that casts a deep shadow of suspicion over all they have said, if it does not altogether discredit their statements, they have the dauntless assurance to say: "The medical profession may rest satisfied that the exhibition herein made, is based on irrefutable testimony." Where is it to be found? Not surely in their "*Statements*," for I venture the allegation, without reluctance or the least misgiving, that a book of the same size, intended to be exclusively dialectic in its character, so entirely made up of empty and independent assertions cannot be found in any language or in any library on earth.

Having disposed of the preface which every sensible man must censure as positively proving that the *Trio* have no confidence in the intelligence of the public or respect for themselves, we proceed to an examination of the statement of Dr. Dudley. This production is perfectly characteristic of its source, for it is as full of duplicity and falsehood as a bad egg is of sulphuretted hydrogen gass and it is quite as offensive. But here it is.

"In 1837, the Trustees of Transylvania University were called upon to fill certain vacant chairs in the Medical Department of the Institution. A short time previous to that period, [Dr. Cross began to practice upon the religious credulity of our society, [Dr. Cross had not lived in Lexington but three months for the ten years previous to his appointment to a professorship in the Transylvania Medical School,] in order to wipe away the odious stains upon a character [and which Dr. Dudley should not only have re-collected in 1837, if indeed such stains existed, when he entreated me to become his colleague, but the sensibility he now affects should have admonished him of the necessity there was for doing something 'to wipe away the odious stains' with which his own character was as thick-spotted as is the body of a leopard] he had formed for himself, and to open thereby a new career to foul ambition. In the exercise of this piece of stratagem he succeeded so far as to secure the confidence of the Rev. N. H. Hall, one of the clergymen of our city, and a Trustee of Transylvania University.

"Actuated by none other than honorable motives, Parson Hall presented the name of Dr. Cross to fill one of the vacant Professorships in the Medical School, and urged his appointment, *with those of the individual members of the Medical Faculty who were opposed to his introduction into the School*; also with Mr. Gratz and other members of the Board of Trustees, the Rev. Mr. Hall made every effort with a view to conciliation and union upon Dr. Cross; pledging himself at the time to Mr. Gratz and other members of the Board of Trustees, that he (Parson Hall) would be among the first in moving for the expulsion of Dr. Cross whenever he should prove himself unworthy of his place. Upon the strength of Parson Hall's influence, and his pledge given, Dr. Cross was elected. Within a few days past, the Rev. gentleman, at my door, re-called to my mind the above particulars regarding the introduction of Dr. Cross into the School; [and I beg the reader to recall this declaration to mind when he reads the two letters of Mr. Hall to be found on subsequent pages;] nor is it without authority [the reader will think otherwise before long] that this allusion is made to the facts in the case.

"The ceremony of installation was scarcely concluded before reasons for regret at his admission into the School began to accumulate; and when the odiousness of his conduct [as was evinced at the trial of Connet, when I proved that either Dr. Dudley knew nothing of the subject of which he spoke or was determined not to tell the truth] admitted no longer of toleration, and his removal became an imperative duty, the action of the Board of Trustees was *unanimous* in dissolving the connexion, [because I had resigned before they knew anything on the subject, if my late colleagues are to be believed in what they say to me in their letter requesting me to resign, and that, too, under circumstances which precluded the hope, if even they desired it, that I would suffer the connexion to continue,] a unanimity well calculated to check the career

of vice, and also to protect society against the arts and devices of the Pretender.

"I have always turned with sentiments of disgust and abhorrence [particularly when, more than a hundred times, invited to his entertainments which I sometimes attended from policy but never from inclination] from the conduct and character of this individual; and neither *before*, nor *during* his connexion with the School, have my feelings of self-respect allowed me, on any occasion, to enter his dwelling as an associate; [but made every effort to make me the associate of those who were his guests.]

"In the last act of the Medical Faculty, preparatory to his removal from the School, I can claim neither *honor* nor *participation*. Without my knowledge, my colleagues consulted together and united in sentiment on the necessity of the measure. When the result of their consultation was communicated to me, I need scarcely add that the measure not only had my approbation, but received my humble, yet firm support.

B. W. DUDLEY.*

A hasty perusal of the statement of Dr. Dudley, will convince the reader that he designs to make the impression that I played the part of a hypocrite with the Rev. N. H. Hall, for the purpose of obtaining his support in furtherance of my project of "foul ambition," to be admitted to a chair in Transylvania University, and that I owed my success to his interposition, and denies by implication, for he would not have dared the responsibility of the broad and unqualified assertion, that he had any agency in the matter. Both positions are wholly indefensible, and it is because he has contracted the inveterate habit of giving an undue latitude to his tongue, that his name has passed into a by-word, being commonly used as a paraphrase for mendicity. To prove that I do him no injustice, it is necessary that I should give a history of my introduction into the Transylvania Medical School. The details

*I said in my *Appeal* that Dr. Dudley, is the "very ideal of self-sufficient folly and vulgar incapacity," and the above statement proves that I spoke of him in more flattering terms than he was entitled to. If there is one word of truth in what he has said in relation to his opinion of and sentiments towards me, it conclusively establishes the fact that, instead of being a Corinthian of the first water amongst fashionable and polished people, he is a gross, impudent upstart who, believes he is moving in the society of those who have no more abhorrence for such as he describes me to be than he has himself. The terms on which I was received at his entertainments are familiar to the people of this city, but he seems wholly insensible of the inexcusable outrage he committed in inviting me into the society of those who frequented them. The public has therefore been requested by himself, to take notice that, the fact of meeting an individual in his drawing-rooms, in the midst of the *elite* of Lexington, is no sort of guarantee that it is meeting with a gentleman. The aristocracy of the *Athens of the West* will consider this a vowel very frank, but they will hardly be so stupid, as to esteem it very flattering. Indeed, so powerful was the impression made on the mind of one of the most enlightened men in Lexington by the statement of Dr. Dudley, that he declared after reading it, that no consideration could induce him to be the bearer of a letter of introduction from him to any man whose acquaintance he desired.

which this history necessarily involves, shall be established either by direct and positive testimony or such convincing corroborative facts, as must exclude all doubt of its strict accuracy from the mind of the candid reader. Before, however, I engage in this history, it is necessary that I should show that Dr. Dudley has taken a very unjustifiable liberty with the name of the Rev. N. H. Hall, the only authority upon which he speaks. When I read the statement of Dr. Dudley, I was surprised to find that Mr. Hall had so wantonly trifled with my character, as represented in that document. It did not, however, disturb me in the least, for besides a letter, in my possession, dated April 29, 1844, that will be found on a subsequent page, which was written to me by Mr. Hall, which not only proves that so far from having had any assurance from me that I desired a chair in the Transylvania Medical School, he was seriously apprehensive I would not accept even after having been elected, I received a few days ago from Dr. Wm. Pawling, of Danville, Kentucky, a letter that will also be found on a subsequent page, in which he says:—"As I have said, I have read the statement of Dr. Dudley made on the authority of the Rev. N. H. Hall, and have come to the conclusion that both of them have forgotten many of the facts connected with the appointment of Dr. Eberle and yourself, for the matter was agreed upon long before the action of the Board of Trustees." But additional and more conclusive proof of the guilty readiness with which Dr. Dudley misrepresents and falsifies, will be found in the following letter, just received from the Rev. N. H. Hall himself.

September 26, 1846,

DR. CROSS—Dear Sir: In answer to your enquiries whether you ever spoke or wrote to me as your friend or agent to use my efforts as Trustee of T. U., to obtain for you a seat in the Medical Department of said Institution, I state that to the best of my recollection you neither spoke or wrote to me on the subject. My efforts to have you appointed to a professorship, were the result of my conviction that you would be of great importance to the Medical Department. This conviction was strengthened by frequent conversations with Dr. W. H. Richardson, who assured me that your medical attainments, with the opinion I had formed of your talents, would eminently qualify you for a professorship in the Transylvania University. The good of the Institution, was the paramount motive with me in all my efforts with reference to the whole subject.

Yours, very respectfully,
N. H. HALL.

Immediately upon my return from Europe in 1835, I was called to the chair of *Materia Medica and Therapeutics*, in the *Medical College of Ohio*. That I was an *advantage* to that *Institution*, as the *Triobroadly assert* I have not been to the *Transylvania Medical School*, is proved by the great increase in the number of students that resorted to it for instruction, during the two years I held a professorship in it. During the session immediately preceding the first that I taught in the *Medical College of Ohio*, there were but 82 pupils, the next we had 131, and 25 of them were from *Kentucky*. During the winter of 1836-37, we had 178, of whom 39 were from my native State. As a compliment to my services during that session, a magnificent gold snuff-box was presented to me by the *Class*, which I have, and wear, still, and which I shall continue to regard as precious evidence that I have rendered some service in the capacity of a teacher of medicine. When my conduct and character was attacked in 1838, somewhat in the same way that it is now, Drs. *Chambers, Hazlett, Young and Gutherie*, of *Zanesville, Ohio*, graduates of the *Medical College of Ohio*, came forward in the midst of a cloud of other witnesses, and defended me in the following manner:-

"Those who are acquainted with the progress and advancement of the *Ohio Medical College*, must perceive that after the acquisition of Dr. *Cross* to the Faculty, (and this we say without any disparagement to the other members, for we love and esteem them all) that it numbered among its students more than it had ever done during any previous session; and the large increase in the session following, shewed clearly that some cause was operating powerfully to increase the reputation of that *Institution*.

"For these salutary effects we conceive the School was chiefly indebted to Professor Cross, not only for the strong interest which he took in its prosperity, but for the warm and devoted attachment which he manifested in the pursuit of Medical knowledge, and the charm of novelty and originality of thought, without neglecting the opinions of others, which so eminently characterized his lectures. With regard to his intercourse with the students, we ever found him gentlemanly, urbane and dignified; not stooping as has been charged, to any littleness, for the purpose of courting popularity, but always ready to assist and encourage us onward."

Such was my position and such my prospects in the *Medical College of Ohio* in 1837, when the dissolution of the *Medical Faculty of Transylvania University* took place. Mrs. *Cross* and our children left *Cincinnati* about the middle of *Januany*, and resided with my father, in this county, for several months. Immediately after *Commencement* in *Cincinnati*, I visited them and remained in *Lexington*

and its neighborhood until the afternoon of the 25th of March 1837, when I returned to *Ohio*. On that day the *Transylvania Medical Faculty* was dissolved, and the public being invited to attend the mock trial which ultimated in the sacrifice of Drs. *Caldwell, Cooke, and Yandell*, I was repairing to the *University*, when I met at Dr. *Pinckard's* corner, Dr. *Richardson*. He asked me if it was my design to attend the trial, and when I responded affirmatively, he remarked:—"That he did not think it was delicate or proper, that I should—that as I was a Professor in a neighboring school, my presence would be looked upon with suspicion, and I would be regarded as a *spy*." Though I did not believe any such interpretation could be put upon my attendance, I at once assured him that I would not be there. Thus, although I was in *Lexington* during the day of the trial, I was not present. This I have ever since deeply regretted, for I now fully understand the motive that prompted Dr. *Richardson* to desire me not to attend. He, I have no doubt, had his eye on me at the time for one of the chairs which he knew to a certainty would be that day vacated, and correctly enough concluded, that should I see and hear publicly revealed, as was the case on that occasion, the falsehood and treachery of which Dr. *Dudley* had been guilty, it would be perfectly useless to address me on the subject of taking a chair in the *Medical School of Transylvania*.*

I returned to *Lexington* about the middle of April. I had received from Mrs. *Cross* a letter stating that my daughter, *Mary Lyle*, was dangerously ill, and that Dr. *Lewis* was her physician. Immediately upon my reaching *Lexington*, which was after dark, I called on Dr. *Lewis* and learned from him that she had been interred the day before. Before I left him he suggested the propriety of my not returning to *Cincinnati* until I had seen those interested in the *Medical School*, for Dr. *Richardson* had gone to *Cincinnati* to consult Dr. *Eberle* and myself on the subject of taking chairs in it. The next day I was in *Lexington*, but had not been in the city more than an hour, when Dr. *Holland*, now of *Nashville*, informed me that Dr. *Dudley*

*It is necessary here to say, that I was kept in a state of almost entire ignorance of the true causes that led to the dissolution of the *Medical Faculty of Transylvania University*, until after the publication of Dr. *Yandell's Narrative of the dissolution of the Medical Faculty of Transylvania University*, and Dr. *Caldwell's Thoughts on Schools of Medicine, their means of instruction and modes of administration, with reference to the Schools of Louisville and Lexington*, which was in the autumn of 1837, several months after I had accepted a professorship in *Transylvania University*. After I had read these works, I began to make enquiries, and almost every individual I spoke to on the subject, admitted in scarcely audible whispers, that the charges preferred against Dr. *Dudley* by Drs. *Caldwell* and *Yandell* were true, and had been fully established before the *Board of Trustees*.

wished to see me at his house. I requested him to say to Dr. D.; that if he had more business with me than I had with him, he could find me at Keizer's Hotel.* A short time afterwards, Dr. Holland informed me that Dr. Dudley would be pleased to meet me at the Hotel at 3 o'clock. We had a protracted interview in the presence of Dr. Holland. He informed me that he and Dr. Richardson had plenary powers to fill the vacant chairs, and made to me a formal tender of the chair of the Institutes. He pressed me to accept it with the greatest earnestness. I reminded him that the fact that I had been in 1834, arrayed against the School constituted with me a formidable objection—for as I had contracted many enemies on account of the publications I considered myself obliged to make, I could not believe that a residence in Lexington would be either pleasant or profitable. To which he responded with a smile that would have wheedled a diplomatist, "*My friend, you should not suffer that to influence you in the slightest degree, if you accede to the proposition I have made to you, you will be identified with us and I will make it my special business to remove every difficulty out of your way.*" To which I replied, that doubtless his influence would be great in reconciling my enemies to the movement he proposed to make in my behalf, but that other objections occurred to my mind which I considered almost insurmountable.—

When he found that his arguments were not likely to prevail, he insisted that I should not return to Cincinnati until the return of Dr. Richardson, who had some days before gone there to negotiate with Dr. Eberle and myself, in relation to taking chairs in Transylvania University. Afterwards, I learned that Dr. Richardson reached Cincinnati and I left it within the same hour, and finding that I was not in that city, he did not even see Dr. Eberle on the subject of his visit. As Dr. Dudley expected, Dr. Richardson returned the same day that I had held the consultation with him in the presence of Dr. Holland. On the next day I had an interview with Drs. Dudley and Richardson in Keizer's Hotel; they jointly tendered me the chair of the Institutes, and urged my acceptance, with a most imploring earnestness. I gave them no further satisfaction, than to say I would join them if I could prevail on Dr. Eberle to come with me, and not without. When they found that this was my final and definitive determination, they in-

sisted that I should return to Cincinnati immediately, and do all in my power to induce Dr. Eberle to join me in the movement they desired me to make, adding whether or not, I should succeed with Dr. Eberle, they would expect me to take the Institutes. After parting with Dr. Dudley, I told Dr. Richardson that it was impossible for me to join them without Dr. Eberle. In obedience to their request, I started for Cincinnati the evening of the same day on which I had had the interview with Drs. Richardson and Dudley.—After my arrival in that city, I held consultations with Dr. Eberle on the subject of his coming to Lexington. Although a heavy guarantee was offered, he finally determined not to leave the Medical College of Ohio, and I immediately addressed the following letter to Drs. Richardson and Dudley:

CINCINNATI, April 20, 1837.

GENTLEMEN: On yesterday I had two protracted interviews with Dr. Eberle, and find him immovably fixed in the determination to sink or swim with the fortunes of the Medical College of Ohio. The guarantee caused him to hesitate, but after consulting with his family he decided not to accept, even when I hinted, on my own authority, to raise it to four thousand dollars. It is the decided opinion here that if you fail in procuring a strong organization there will be in our school three hundred pupils next winter—but this I much doubt. Eberle feels and, I think, has acted under its influence.

In the interviews I have had with you on the subject of joining your school, I have not failed to let you know that my movements would much depend on those of Dr. Eberle. Indeed, I informed Dr. Richardson that my going to Lexington would depend on his going with me. It will not surprise or disappoint you, to learn that I cannot accept on the terms proposed. I am much too poor to exchange a certainty for an uncertainty; but make me safe, and I will contribute my feeble exertions most willingly and earnestly to sustain the character of my Alma Mater. My feelings are already with you, and it is with great difficulty that I am enabled to resist the temptation of joining you at all hazards. If I am guaranteed \$3000 a year, for three years, or \$3500 for two years, I will come, but if to both of these propositions you object, I have decided to remain where I am.

If to either of these propositions you should accede, let me suggest that though I much prefer the chair of Institutes, you perhaps cannot do better under existing circumstances, than to place me in the chair of Theory and Practice, and give Dr. Gross the chair of Institutes. I have not spoken to him on the subject, nor will I until I have your authority. A speedy decision is no less important to you than it is to me, you will therefore, I trust, let me know at as early a period as possible, what I am to expect.

Yours, respectfully,
JAMES C. CROSS.

DRS. RICHARDSON AND DUDLEY.

*This plain unctuous reply, resulted from the fact, that, not having had, previously, any further acquaintance with Dr. Dudley, than a civil street nod of recognition and believing, from what Dr. Lewis had told me the night before, that he desired to speak to me of the reorganization of the Transylvania Medical School, I was determined he should not think that I desired a chair in it, or that I wished to become his colleague.

This letter has been found amongst the papers of the late Dr. Richardson, or it is in the possession of Dr. Dudley.

On the 24th of April instead of a written answer as I expected, from Drs. Richardson and Dudley, I received a visit from Dr. Wm. Pawling, then of Lexington, but at present of Danville, Kentucky. He informed me that upon the authority of those individuals, he had come to renew the offer of the chair of Theory and Practice and of the Institutes to Dr. Eberle and myself. He soon found that it was perfectly useless to talk to the former on the subject, and then he turned his attention to me exclusively. Drs. R. and D. were wise in the selection of their minister. Dr. Pawling and I had been during a considerable part of our boyhood raised together, and for him I cherished, as I do still, the highest respect and warmest friendship. After much discussion and argumentation, he finally extorted from me a reluctant consent to take the Institutes without a guarantee.

I here subjoin a letter from Dr. Pawling, which not only confirms the statement above made, but which contradicts that made on the authority of Mr. Hall.

DANVILLE, Ky., Sept 18, 1846.

DR. CROSS—DEAR SIR: I received your letter of the 10th inst, but was too unwell to examine its contents, or to answer it immediately. Nor had I as you supposed read the “*Statements of Facts*” by Drs. Dudley, Mitchell, and Peter, but have since. You ask if I did not visit Cincinnati by authority of Drs. Dudley and Richardson for the purpose of tendering you the Chair of Institutes, &c., in the Medical Department of Transylvania University, and whether or not it was exclusively through my persuasion that you were induced finally to agree to accept it. After the dissolution of the faculty in March, 1837, efforts were being made to fill the vacancies occasioned by the removal of Drs. Caldwell, Yandell, and Cooke, I suggested to Dr. Bush the policy and propriety of tendering the Theory and Practice to Dr. Eberle, and the Institutes to you. Soon afterwards I had an interview with Dr. Dudley on the subject, who objected to you at first on account of the irritability of your temper. The matter, however, was fully and ably discussed by Drs. Dudley, Richardson, Bush, the Rev. N. H. Hall, myself, and I think Dr. Peter. It was finally determined that the nominations should be made—*Dr. Dudley not only having become willing but anxious that the matter should be speedily consummated.* In consequence of this determination I was urged by Drs. Dudley and Richardson to go, and I went to Cincinnati with authority to tender the Chair of Theory and Practice to Dr. Eberle, with a guarantee of \$5,000 per annum for three years, and to tender you the Chair of Institutes, &c. When I arrived at Cincinnati, I visited you first, and made known to you the object of my visit. You at first seemed pleased but soon began to make objec-

tions. I used many arguments to convince you that it was to your interest to accept, and you finally agreed to take the Chair of Institutes, &c. Dr. Eberle positively declined, but sometime afterwards sent his son over to Lexington to say that he would accept with a guarantee of \$4,000. As I have said I have read the statement of Dr. Dudley made on the authority of the Rev. N. H. Hall, and have come to the conclusion that both of them have forgotten many of the facts connected with the appointment of Dr. Eberle and yourself, for the matter was agreed upon long before the action of the Board of Trustees.

Yours, WM. PAWLING.

P. S. In regard to some of the questions you ask me I have no distinct recollection.

W. P.

My colleagues in the Medical College of Ohio knew that Dr. Pawling was in Cincinnati—knew the object of his visit, for they had been informed of it by both Dr. Eberle and myself, and consequently two of them immediately upon his leaving the city called upon me to ascertain the result of his mission. I frankly told them that I had agreed to go to Lexington. Several days having elapsed, one of the same individuals visited me and asked that as I had determined to leave them why I did not resign. Regarding my election to the Chair of the Institutes, in Transylvania University, a mathematical certainty, I did actually resign my professorship in the Medical College of Ohio before I received any intelligence that I had been elected to the Institutes in Transylvania University. The first or second of May I received a letter from Mr. Robert Wickliffe, Sen., Chairman of the Board of Trustees, together with half a dozen or more from other individuals, all of which informed me of my election. Here are the letters, and I beg the reader to mark their character and import, for he cannot fail to see that great apprehension was felt that I would not accept.*

LEXINGTON, April 29, 1837.

JAMES C. CROSS, M. D.—DEAR SIR: I am instructed by the Board of Trustees of Transylvania University to notify you of your appointment to the Chair of the Institutes and Medical Jurisprudence in the Medical Department of Transylvania University, and to express to you the strong desire of the trustees that you will be pleased to accept, and to notify them that you do so as soon as your convenience will allow. To which I beg leave to add my own.

Very respectfully,

R. WICKLIFFE,
Chairman B. T. T. U.

This letter is given that the reader may ob-

*This is altogether incompatible with the idea that I electioneered for a chair in Transylvania University, and it proves conclusively not only that rather extraordinary pains had been taken to induce me to take a chair in it, but that after all they were not fully satisfied with the reluctant assurance I had given their minister Dr. Pawling.

serve the correspondence between its date and the dates of those of the following:

LEXINGTON, KY., April 30, 1837.

DEAR DOCTOR: I have sat down to write to you as a friend, to give you frankly and candidly my views in relation to the position you now occupy in regard to the Medical School of Transylvania, and in doing so I trust that you will attribute what I say to you to the very best feelings for you personally.

The trustees of the University held a meeting yesterday for the purpose of reorganizing the Medical School. This they did without much difficulty, although your friend Yandell, had some advocates for reappointment in the board. When, however, it was understood that both Dr. Dudley and yourself had feelings towards that gentleman that rendered it impossible for you to go into a faculty with him, he went by the board without difficulty. The faculty, as reorganized, stands as follows: *Dudley, Richardson, and Short*, in the respective chairs heretofore occupied by them, Dr. Cross, of Cincinnati, professor of the Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence; Dr. Fearne, of Alabama, professor of the Theory and Practice; and professor Silliman, of Yale College, professor of Chemistry. This, you must perceive is a remarkably able reorganization, and shows one thing at least, that even if they cannot procure some of the gentlemen, they are determined to make the very ablest selections. It is supposed here that Fearne can be induced to come; whether or not this is true remains to be seen.

Now, Doctor, to the object of this letter, which is to *urge you by all means to come*. It is your best interest, I sincerely believe, to join this school. I give you this as my opinion, because I believe that this school must and will stand upon higher ground than ever it has done. It cannot but succeed, and with its success yours of course follows. Your friends here are extremely anxious for you to join this faculty, and will do every thing in their power for you should you come here. I know that I have warm feelings upon this subject, but I do not believe they in the least warp my judgment. This is the place for you; your family are here; your inclinations lead hither; and in a pecuniary point of view, you must be decidedly benefitted by the change.

I give these views to you as your friend, and sincerely hope that you will not disregard them.

Very truly your friend,

D. C. WICKLIFFE.

N. B. I have written this in great haste for fear I may not be in time for the mail.

D. C. W.

LEXINGTON, April 29, 1837.

DEAR DOCTOR: We the trustees of Transylvania University have this day appointed a new medical faculty consisting of the following gentlemen: Drs. Dudley, Richardson, and Short, to the chairs they formerly filled; Dr. Fearne to the chair formerly filled by Dr. Cooke; yourself to the chair formerly filled by Dr. Caldwell; and professor Silliman to the Chemical chair. Your appointment was one in which some of us felt a

deep interest; *doubts were expressed by some whether you would come if elected*. I pledged myself that you would—*Col. Combe and Gwin Tompkins stood with me for you like men*. All appear delighted with the faculty we have appointed. Now, sir, *your friends are staked for your acceptance and able performance*. When you come among us I hope you will come with a spirit of amity and friendship to all persons, who may hope to see you breaking with some of your fellow-laborers in the faculty. I hope you will come soon and be found at your post—I have much to say to you. *Dr. Richardson is the only one of the faculty that I have seen since we closed our session*—he is much delighted and wishes you to come as soon as practicable. I have much to say to you when I see you, which I trust will be very soon at my house. I feel that Mrs. Cross will be gratified, and that all your friends will be glad. Here, sir, is a triumph over prejudice, &c., that ought to gratify and humble you. I write in great haste. Your real friend,

N. H. HALL.

The following letter which I received at the same time from Mrs. Cross, has been submitted to Mr. Joseph Ficklin, the postmaster of this city, and he has certified on the back of it that it has the usual Lexington Post-Office stamp, and therefore that it was written to me from this county and mailed in Lexington, on the 30th of April, 1837:

FAYETTE CO., April 30th, 1837.

MY DEAR HUSBAND: Dr. Richardson called here last evening to inform us that you had been elected to fill Dr. Caldwell's Chair. *Now their greatest fear is that you will not accept*. He said he would write to you as soon as he reached home and that I must write also immediately to prevail on you to accept. But I hope there is no necessity for persuasion on my part, as you already know nothing would gratify your father and myself more than your compliance with their wishes if you should think it to your interest. I will not now write you a long letter, as you will have but little time to look at anything that comes from me, as you are to receive letters from Drs. Dudley,* Pawling, Holland, and Richardson, besides one from the Chairman of the Board. Now there is one thing I must insist on, should there be any difficulty in your mind in regard to the propriety of accepting, which is, that you will not send in your resignation before you come over and see us. Dr. Richardson's boy has called for this letter—he is on his way to the Post-Office. Let me know when to expect you.

Your affectionate wife,

AGNES A. CROSS.

CANELAND, April 30th, 1837.

DEAR DOCTOR: I should have written by yesterday's mail, immediately *after the adjournment of the Board of Trustees, but was carried off by Dr. Pinckard to see one of his patients, and did*

*Dr. Richardson had learned from Dr. Pawling, before he saw Mrs. Cross, which was on the afternoon of the 29th April, that Dr. Dudley had written to me after persuading him not to write.

not return to the hotel in time to write before the mail closed. Drs. Dudley and Pawling, I learned, wrote you the result of the election for a new Faculty of the Medical Department of Transylvania by the Trustees, and that you have been called to the Chair of the "Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence." I hope you will find it compatible with your interests in all points of view to accept the station and return to Kentucky, where you have so many inducements to cast your fortunes among those who have known you all your life. *At all events do not decide against acceptance until you have made another visit to Lexington, and then and there take the council of those you know to be your true friends.* We hope to have your approbation to the other appointments made beyond those who were members of the late Faculty; i. e. Drs. Silliman and Fearne. Should we secure their co-operation, I have no fear of the result, or even without them we can surpass all other Western Schools of Physic.

I need not urge upon you the importance of an early decision on your part, as it may alike address itself to your interest as well as ours.

I am, very respectfully, your friend,
W. H. RICHARDSON.

DEAR SIR: The Trustees have been in session this day and re-organized the Medical Department, introducing yourself, Dr. Silliman, and Dr. Fearne. *I hope the arrangement may meet your approbation and that you will promptly respond to the notification on the part of the Board of Trustees of your election.* We are determined to make the School more acceptable to the community than it has been hitherto, as with its present organization it is certainly capable of being rendered more useful.

Your position here will be far more agreeable than where you now are; nor can I doubt about the movement being to your advantage in a pecuniary point of view.

We are desirous to hear from you as early as convenient and hope to see you very soon in Lexington.

Respectfully, your obedient servant,
B. W. DUDLEY.

J. C. CROSS, M. D.
Lex., April 29, 1837.

Having finished the perusal of the above letters what must a judicious public think of the candor, fairness, or honor of Dr. Dudley? Will his timid, sordid sycophants have the assurance to repeat again the silly charge that I electioneered for a chair in Transylvania University? Must not every manly and generous heart loathe the touch of that man as pollution and his contact as moral death, who, after pressing me by those important considerations that generally influence human conduct to relinquish an important, a profitable, and an enviable position in the Medical College of Ohio, in order to become his colleague, did not shrink with instinctive horror from the unblushing profligacy of the declaration that both "before" and *during* my connexion with the School he turned with sentiments of dis-

gust and abhorrence from my conduct and character?

But this is not the whole or the worst of his odious and treacherous conduct. Soon after I took up my residence in Lexington, the following statement was made to me by Dr. Richardson, and to the truth of every word of what I utter on his authority I solemnly testify. He remarked: "You will be surprised, sir, when I tell you that Dr. Dudley, instead of supporting your nomination for the Chair of Institutes, as he assured you he would, did all in his power to defeat it, but succeeded in prevailing on but three of the Trustees (Jno. Tilford, Benjamin Gratz, and Spencer Cooper—the Board then consisted of sixteen) to vote against it.* After you were elected we left the University together, when he asked me if I intended to write to you, and responding affirmatively, he appeared to object to it, and said that he thought that the notification of the Chairman would be sufficient. After some further conversation on the subject, finding that it would give him dissatisfaction, I promised him I would not write, but at the same time determined to request others to do so, for I was very apprehensive that you would not accept unless pressed on the subject and felt perfectly certain that, should you hear of his conduct, you would not.† After requesting several individuals to write to you, I accidentally met Dr. Pawling on the sidewalk of the Court-House square and urged him to do so also. He answered that he had written, and showed me a letter for you which he said he intended putting into the Post-office immediately. He then asked me if I did not mean to write also, and when I replied that such had been my intention, but, in consequence of Dr. Dudley's opposition to it, I had promised him that I would not. Dr. Pawling appeared much surprised and replied that, not more than half an hour before, he had seen Dr. Dudley drop a letter into the Post-Office for you. At this announcement I was perfectly confounded—I thought I knew him, but his duplicity and meanness exceeds the worst conceptions I had formed of his

* Dr. Dudley's statement proves that he opposed my election, for he says, "the individual members of the Medical Faculty, who were opposed to his introduction into the School." At that time there were but three members; i. e. Drs. Dudley, Short, and Richardson—as no hint has yet been given that Dr. Richardson was opposed to it, and as Dr. Dudley speaks in the plural number, he must refer to himself as being one of the opposition. Dr. Pawling says that Dr. Dudley "became not only willing but anxious" that I should have the Chair of Institutes "long before the action of the Board of Trustees."

† This accounts for the number and character of the letters, and all of them have not been given to the public, that I received, dated Lexington, April 29th and 30th, immediately after my election. It is utterly impossible that so many letters should have been written to me at the same time and upon the same subject, unless some extraordinary cause had prompted them.

character; it appears utterly impossible for him to pass a single day without engaging in some knavish intrigue to circumvent and injure some one.”*

Now, I ask the reader to pause and reflect a moment upon my situation, had Dr. Dudley succeeded in defeating my election before the Board of Trustees. Confiding in the assurances I had received from Dr. Richardson and himself in person, while in Lexington and afterwards in Cincinnati, through Dr. Pawling, it is evident that as I had resigned my Chair in the Medical College of Ohio, before hearing the result of the action of the Board of Trustees of Transylvania University upon my nomination, I would have been without a professorship altogether. Upon such atrocious Machiavelian conduct I will not pause to comment, for every man in whose heart there is a sentiment of honor will say that it stands forward in all the harshness of unmitigated crime, without a single alleviating circumstance to conciliate resentment or propitiatory regard.

Could such proofs of utterly hopeless profligacy inspire a man of even the vulgardest notions of honor, with any other feelings than those of deep and rancorous animosity? Dr. Dudley had hardly escaped “unwhipped of justice,” for an outrage which has caused him to lose the confidence of every honorable man, beyond the hope of condonation before his ma-

lignant and crafty spirit became restlessly impatient to involve him in fresh acts of turpitude and treachery. Like Melpomene, who it is said begat her children merely to divert her melancholy. Dr. Dudley, sneakingly and fraudulently, attempted to ruin my professorial prospects, merely for the purpose I suppose, as the boys say, “to keep his hand in.” This inference is utterly irresistible, for at that time it is impossible for him to have had any just cause of complaint against me—indeed he seemed to smile upon me with peculiar complacency. But I have since learned that when most bland, that smile is least trustworthy.—Ever since my resignation or *expulsion*, if the reader prefers the language of the Trio, his *nephew* in an article in response to those written by Dr. Pinckard, refers to a pamphlet of mine, published more than twelve years ago, in terms that prove that Dr. Dudley was not only proud of my approbation, but considered himself under obligations to me. His *nephew*, after quoting what I had said of him in 1834, and the reader, could he refer to it, would see that it was as much the result of prudence as of principle, exclaims:—“High honor to the generous heart that prompted such feelings, and knowing Dr. Dudley as I do, I believe this unthought and unexpected homage of a man of genius gave him more sincere pleasure, than those whose bosoms are strangers to such impulses can imagine.”

For ever dealing in subterfuge and stratagem—in contrivances and craft, as the last display of his peculiar faculties had been wantonly made for my special benefit, it was impossible that I should feel for him any other than that deep and enduring animosity which “wisdom holds unlawful ever.” His turning from me with sentiments of disgust and abhorrence, he knows full well was the result of necessity, not of choice; for although I was unfortunately his colleague and thus obliged to keep my feelings under a painful subjection, I could not always refrain from expressing my opinion of him.* Often have I thought, when obliged to take his hand, for the sake of appearances, that had it been dangling from a tainted corpse, I would have shrunk from it with less abhorrence.

It was useless for Dr. Dudley to say that “The ceremony of installation was scarcely

*This Mitchell says happened so early as 1838, and I have no doubt he speaks the truth, but it is a wonder, for had he supposed I would thus admit it, he would have solemnly testified that I had eulogised Dr. D. from the first to the last moment of my connexion with him. I not only told Mitchell, I suppose, for I told others, rather *sub rosa* however, and merely for the purpose of keeping the world from knowing what it had no right to know, at least from me, that he not only exerted an influence to which he was not entitled, but insisted on measures injurious to the School, and was guilty of conduct that rendered his character odious.

*Besides the confidence inspired by the air of sincerity with which the above statement of Dr. Richardson was made, the conduct which he reported to me was so characteristic of the man that no one who knows him will think of questioning its accuracy. His life having been wasted in intrigue and stratagem, and having been obliged as a consequence to resort, at one time or other, to the almost endless subterfuges of hypocrisy, for the purpose of attaining his ends or concealing his delinquencies, all sense of justice and all respect for truth seem to have been completely obliterated from his mind. So true is this that he has adopted a peculiar and dangerous phraseology—he has substituted the pernicious word *policy* for those old, time honored and decisive terms *truth and justice*. He was never known, so far as my researches have extended, and they remount to the period when he was a salesmen in a dry-goods' Store, to defend or inveigh against a proposition because it was just and proper, but because it was politic to do so; and I have in consequence been obliged to hear the word *policy* fall with priggish owlish gravity so often from his lips that I became as tired of hearing it as the Athenians were of hearing Aristides called the Just. But the word *policy* used for the purpose of bringing truth and justice into discredit was particularly offensive because of its pernicious moral influence. When the young mind hears those of standing making by-words and jests of things that cannot be too deeply reverenced, no surprise need be felt should it cease to respect them or suffer them to become high and honorable motives of human action. I have not been an inattentive observer of the influence which the example of Dr. Dudley has exerted over the principles of those by whom he is immediately surrounded, and I feel fully justified in asserting that, like the fabulous Upas that overshadowed and poisoned the land, it has corrupted the shadows of just thought, correct feeling, and independent action. And I have been surprised and mortified to see men of sense pretend to believe that by so patrician a manœuvre they justified a falsehood and excused or palliated an injustice. Such sophistry will for a while only stifle the cries of conscience.

concluded, before reasons for regret at his admission into the School began to accumulate," for he knows well that before I gave a single lecture in the Institution, my hatred for his sentiments and his principles had become deep, envenomed and implacable, while my regret at being associated with him, awkwardly disguised, was intense and abiding. With his treachery towards his colleagues, Drs. Caldwell, Yandell and Cooke, I had been made acquainted; of his false and fraudulent conduct towards me, I had become satisfied; with his bold and defying libertinism, the town had become so familiar that it had almost ceased to be a topic of remark or a subject of censure;—with his contempt for Christianity or any other self-denying religion, not only the Priest but the public was shocked; and of his unscrupulosity as a medical witness, I had the most convincing proof on more than one occasion. These facts made him so odious in my sight, that it was with difficulty I could endure his presence. Our intercourse for years was, therefore, uniformly civil and distant, but like those mathematical lines which appear to be taking all possible pains to approach one another, but never get a jot the nearer for it. Indeed, instead of getting nearer, the divergence after the session of 1841--2 became daily more and more obvious, until the formal and repulsive courtesy that characterized it bordered upon actual hostility. Having at an early period of my association with him lost all confidence in his integrity, and respect for his principles, it was impossible for him to conciliate me by his hypocritical professions of friendship, or to deceive me by his cunningly devised arts. Finding, as at least one, if not more of my colleagues did also, that

"True reconciliation could never grow,
Where wounds of deadly hate had pierced so deep."

he determined through his "painted Jesabes" to undermine and destroy my character in Lexington, and then to drive me out of the School on the first opportunity.*

At page 5, I assert that by my energy and enterprise, the complete overthrow of the Medical Department of Transylvania University, was averted in 1837. This, if not formally, has been impliedly denied. What are the facts of the case? The letters addressed to me while in Cincinnati, informing me of my appointment to the Chair of Institutes, prove that at the same time Dr. Fearne was elected to the

* It is in my power to prove that he resorted to a most disgraceful expedient to injure and, if possible, to destroy my standing and that of another individual; an expedient of which no other man would have dreamed, but himself, and which very few would believe, unless established by the most satisfactory testimony. But this is postponed, for the present, from prudential considerations exclusively.

Chair of Theory and Practice, and Dr. Silsby to that of Chemistry. These gentlemen declined with mortifying promptitude the proffered honor. We had a meeting of the Faculty some time in May, I believe, and although Dr. Dudley always turned from me with disgust and abhorrence, I was elected Dean. This was a trifling distinction, it is true, but as all the members of the Faculty are obliged to have more or less intercourse with that officer, it is surprising that Dr. Dudley, with the sentiments he professes to have always entertained for me, should have suffered it. This, without difficulty, he could have prevented, for he and Dr. Short could easily have out voted Dr. Richardson, and upon the support of Dr. Short he could have confidently relied, for they always, I believe, acted together, except in that disgraceful transaction when Drs. Caldwell, Cooke and Yandell were sacrificed.

Having learned that neither Professor Silsby nor Dr. Fearne would accept, the Faculty met on the 13th of June, 1837, to consult upon the means of filling the two still vacant Chairs. The efforts that had hitherto been made having proved unsuccessful, both Drs. Dudley and Richardson became discouraged and obviously began to despond. I was asked to whom the Chairs should be tendered next, when I responded to no one, at least in the way that had been adopted. I remarked that the Institution had already suffered on account of the difficulties that had been encountered in filling the vacancies; and, as the impression had gone abroad that the School was irrecoverably ruined in consequence of the dissolution of the Faculty, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to procure the co-operation of men of reputation and importance in the profession—that the only safe and successful plan, consequently, would be to send some member of the Faculty to consult in person with such individuals as we should desire for the vacant Chairs, and not to make any appointments until after we had received satisfactory assurance that they would be accepted. The prudence and propriety of this suggestion was at once admitted, and, after all three of my colleagues had positively refused* to go on the mission, they united in ur-

* The refusal of Dr. Dudley to go on this mission no one will be surprised at, when he reflects that, he had just been guilty of an act which would have made a very uncommon effort of assurance on his part necessary in order to enable him to propose to any honest man to become his colleague; and the fact that he is the first individual who made a tender of the Chair of Institutes to me, is the only circumstance, independently of his duplicity, that has induced me to suspect that he did not think us well of me as he professed at that time. Be that as it may, I have always regarded the proposition as a gross personal insult, for which I have not forgiven him, and I probably never shall look upon it with more indulgence than I do at present.

ging me to assume the responsibility of filling the vacancies. This was not what I expected; a little reflection will convince the reader that it was both improper and unreasonable. It was improper to send on such a mission a man who had not been more than a month a member of the Faculty; in fact it was impossible for such an one to speak of the situation and prospects of the Institution in such a way as to influence the judgments of those who had been already, by the representations of a certain individual, seriously prejudiced against it. I urged the unreasonableness of the request on the ground that, as I had not as yet derived any advantage from the Institution, no obligation of the kind rested on me. Besides, I was called to a Chair in which I had never taught, and therefore it was reasonable to suppose there was little enough time before the opening of the course for preparation. These considerations seemed to have no weight with my colleagues, and, seeing that nothing would be done unless I agreed to take the responsibility of filling the vacancies, I determined to go on the mission. I had imprudently put my hand into the lion's mouth and thought it wise to take it out as easily and as speedily as possible. I was in the School and was compelled, from a regard for my professorial reputation to do all in my power to sustain it. Here is my commission and the reader will perceive that it made me not only Minister Plenipotentiary but actual Ambassador of the Transylvania Medical Faculty, for it bound my colleagues to ratify any act of mine in relation to the filling of the Chair of Theory and Practice. The reader will observe, also, that it bears the autographical sanction of that finished intriguer and arch traitor who has had the frontless audacity to say to the public, in his Statement, that he has always turned from me with disgust and abhorrence. Not only have I proved out of his own mouth that he *professed* (he is entirely innocent of sincerity or honesty, and a truth has never been traced to him, that I could hear of, since he was a school boy) to be earnestly desirous to have me for a colleague, but this commission conclusively establishes the fact that he was also willing that I should select a colleague "*of the same sort*" for him in a Professor of the Theory and Practice:

"The undersigned is directed by the Medical Faculty of Transylvania University to authorize and request Professor Cross, one of their colleagues, to proceed to Philadelphia and elsewhere, with as little delay as possible, in order to secure a suitable individual as Professor of the Theory and Practice in said School."

B. W. DUDLEY, Chairman.

LEXINGTON, Ky., June 13, 1837."

Without delay I hurried to the Atlantic seaboard and found to my mortification and disappointment that difficulties beset my path numerous and almost insurmountable. The fatal impression had been deeply made in the minds of the most of those with whom I had interviews that the recent dissolution of the Medical Faculty had utterly and forever blasted the prospects of the School. This impression it was impossible for me entirely to eradicate, although I did much to weaken its influence. Little progress, however, was made with such men as were able, by their character and standing, to strengthen or reflect credit upon the Institution. When I began to fear that my mission would prove wholly unproductive, I met, in the city of New York, an old colleague, who informed me that he wished to be appointed to a certain Chair in the University of the State of New York, and that I could, if I would, be of great service in the furtherance of his views. The idea at once struck me that while I was promoting the interests of a friend, I might oblige Dr. Eberle to take the Chair of Theory and Practice in Transylvania University. It was also stated to me by the individual to whom I have just alluded that it was more than probable the incumbent of a certain Chair would be removed, and that Dr. Cobb, another old and highly valued colleague, would be his successor. These facts lead me to believe that the game was now, in a great measure, in my own hands. While I was in New York, the individual to whom I refer, chiefly, as I have reason to believe, through my agency, obtained the situation to which he aspired, and immediately afterwards I wrote to Dr. Eberle. I depicted to him the discouraging prospects of the Medical College of Ohio, with two Chairs vacant, and the probability that a third would be in a short time in the same situation. My arguments prevailed, for before I returned to Lexington he had intimated, through his son, to my colleagues that he would take the Chair of Theory and Practice in Transylvania University. After vacating two Chairs in the Medical College of Ohio, with the prospect of a third one losing

vacancies; i. e. of the Chairs of Theory and Practice and Chemistry, but the above commission empowers me with authority in relation to the former only. The verbal understanding was that I should fill both, but when the commission was drawn up, and it was by himself, and signed by Dr. Dudley, it was found that it gave me authority to act in relation to only one of the vacancies. This is easily understood. The moment it was ascertained that Prof. Silliman would not accept, Dr. Dudley turned his attention to Peter, and he did not relinquish him until after Mitchell's election. It was foreseen by Dr. Richardson and myself that no matter who might be offered to the Board of Trustees, the name of Peter would be presented—and this turned out to be the fact. But this did not deter me from attempting to fill the Chemical Chair, in which I succeeded, but most unfortunately with a heartless scoundrel.

* I have said that the object of my mission was to fill the

its incumbent soon, I could speak with confidence of the almost certain success of the School in which I had embarked my fortunes, for the former, our most formidable—indeed, at that time, our only rival—was, by the events to which I have just referred, reduced, at least for the present, to rather an unpromising state. My more confident tone and manner, which arose out of this circumstance, enabled me finally to prevail on several able men to become candidates for the Chair of Theory and Practice. Although I had full power to give that Professorship to whom I pleased, I went no further in my negotiations on the subject than I have stated, for I was almost certain that Dr. Eberle, after the reception of the letter I had written to him from New York, would consent to come to Lexington, and I knew that, should this happen, his reputation and the fact of his having been located in the West, and having taught several years in a Western Institution, would render him more acceptable to my colleagues than any other individual. The result realized my expectations.* Thus, had I not accepted the Institutes, Drs. Dudley and Richardson never could have prevailed on Dr. Eberle to join them, and consequently three very subordinate men, and I knew them well, the arrangement was already made, would have been appointed to the Chairs vacated by Drs. Caldwell, Cooke, and Yandell, and the School would have sunk, long before this, into its present insignificance. One of that brilliant trio is now a member of the Faculty.

Nor is this the whole of my personal agency in the re-organization of the Faculty in 1837. The Chair of Chemistry, as has been stated, was also vacant. After the declination of Professor Silliman, the attention of Dr. Dudley was directed to his sequacious *protege* Peter, which filled the little animal with so much delight that he skipped and frisked about as if a horse-fly had him to break. The design of Dr. Dudley was, I suppose, to reward him for his servility in the nefarious affair to which I have repeatedly alluded, but more particularly, I presume, for a reason that it would not do to whisper into "ears polite." Let us not pry too closely into the *nice* and *secret* springs of action of this upright and immaculate character—this "curled darling" of

*My conduct towards the Medical College of Ohio deserves a word of explanation. I was not prompted by any feeling of hostility towards that Institution; on the contrary, I have every reason to be gratified and proud of my connexion with it, for I believe I was associated with high-minded and honorable men. My conduct is to be explained upon the principle that I felt bound by every fair and honorable means to advance the interests of the Institution with which I was connected. This I did while in the Medical College of Ohio—this I did while in the Medical Department of Transylvania University—and this I will do in regard to any School of Medicine with which I may in future be connected.

society—or we may peradventure irrecoverably sully the purity of somebody's honor. But really there is no need for such scrupulosity, for the object of Dr. Dudley's munificent patronage is like the Roman Emperor who found no unpleasant odor in the money that proceeded from a disgusting and disreputable tax. Dr. Short supported Dr. Dudley in his partiality for Peter, while Dr. Richardson and myself were irreconcilably opposed to him. We believed him utterly unprincipled (and every subsequent act of his life has proved that we were not mistaken) and but indifferently qualified for the position to which he had the vanity to aspire. I suggested the name of Mitchell, but to him all my colleagues seemed to be irreconcilably opposed. My only hope consisted in bringing Dr. Richardson over to my views. I had ascertained from the students who had attended the Medical College of Ohio, the session before he was *expelled*,* that he was a tolerable lecturer, and from other sources that he was a respectable chemist. These considerations did not satisfy Dr. Richardson, who charged him with being a narrow-minded, bigotted, presumptuous puritanical Presbyterian. On these points I had nothing to say, for at that time I knew nothing. I never believed that he would be more than a respectable acquisition; but I understood that he had agreed to take the chair of Chemistry in the Louisville Medical Institute, and while I believed that he would answer our purposes, an opportunity to embarrass our Louisville enemies thus presented itself, provided we could induce him to break the engagement he had entered into. They had not yet been able to complete the organization of the Institute Faculty, and I felt it to be important to us that they should find as much difficulty on that point as possible, and so soon as I communicated the fact to Dr. Richardson that by drawing off Mitchell we would probably cause those whom he hated much inconvenience, he not only ceased to oppose him but became a warm advocate for his appointment to the Chemical chair in our school.† On my way East in search of a

*One would suppose that a man who had been unceremoniously driven out of one Institution would have spoken more modestly and less flippantly on the sore subject of *expulsion* than he has in the "*Statements of Facts*." But he knows how it affected him, and as he was never known to impart pleasure when he could inflict pain, he foolishly imagined, when speaking of it in the coarse manner he has, that he was torturing me. He should, however, have recollect that I am in no way dependent on Schools of Medicine for such a support as should satisfy the ambition of a gentleman—while he, when I took him out of a dirty drug shop in Cincinnati, was on the point of taking the advice Grumio gave to Cathearine—which was, to *sup on the mustard with the beef*. Poverty is no disgrace, for it was the glory of Fabricius; and no other man would have the inhumanity to remind of it but one who is so malignantly ungrateful as Mitchell.

†It is said that "revenge is the most delicious morsel the

professor of Theory and Practice, I passed through Cincinnati, where Mitchell resided, and soon prevailed on him to become a candidate for the Chemical chair. Supported by Dr. Richardson and myself, and the name of Peter, his competitor, being presented by Drs. Dudley and Short to the Board of Trustees, he was easily elected, Peter having received but a single vote. The following letter conclusively proves that it was the opinion of Dr. Caldwell, at least, that Mitchell had violated a solemn engagement with him, and when he tells me as he does in this letter that he had "no qualms of conscience on the subject," no one will doubt him, but all would be surprised to hear that his conscience had ever reproached him for the commission of any atrocity.

CINCINNATI, July 29, 1837.

DR. CROSS—DEAR SIR: On my return (he had been in Lexington) I found a tremendous epistle from Dr. Caldwell, waiting for me. It is full of contradictions and misrepresentations, and I have given him a very brief reply in the mildest style I can employ, and yet with all needed firmness. He has been terribly discomposed as you may judge from the fact that he called on my father and brother in Philadelphia to get them to remonstrate with me. Should any one at all favorable to him in Lexington be disposed to say aught against me in this matter, just assert if you please, that I am quite willing to submit my conduct to the judgment of any three disinterested gentlemen in Kentucky. My movements were based upon the council of Judge Burnett and Rev. Dr. Agdelott, (who as you know is an Episcopalian,) and I have no qualms of conscience on the subject. Dr. Caldwell seems to desire a controversy, but he shall not be gratified.

Yours, THOS. D. MITCHELL.

The facts now spread before the public will enable the reader to determine whether or not I averted the complete overthrow of the Transylvania Medical School in 1837. But the postponement of that "ill-stared and un-blessed catastrophe," for it must come, and it cannot possibly be prorogued much longer, does not comprehend any thing like the whole of the services rendered by me to the Medical School of Transylvania, nor will it enable any one to judge of the full extent of its obligations to me. The following statement will prove this. During the session of 1837-'38 we had the misfortune to lose Dr. Eberle by death, and it is said that both Mitchell and Dr. Short wished to be transferred to the chair thus vacated, and that I resorted to very unjustifiable means to prevent either of them obtaining the object of their wishes. My motives for wishing to defeat the hopes of Mitchell are easily divined. He was wholly

disqualified—he had seen little or no practice, and unless he changes his language and manners he will not see much more. Besides I thought it was infinitely presumptuous in him to desire to be transferred to the most important chair in the school, when he had served but a single session in it, and had been called to it only the year before, not because he was a celebrated physician, but because he was believed to be a tolerable chemist. As a conclusive reason why he should be transferred to the chair of Theory and Practice, he informed the class of 1837-'38 that his old preceptor, Dr. Rush, who for so many years held that chair with the most distinguished ability in the Pennsylvania Medical School, commenced his professorial career in that of chemistry. Between the preceptor and the pupil he imagined there was a most remarkable resemblance, while every one else thought that they were no more alike than a horse is like a hand-saw. Certainly the burlesque extravaganza of this man's pretensions presents one of the most incomprehensible delusions that is to be found in the eventful records of human imbecility.

There was at least one reason of a different kind altogether to explain my opposition to Dr. Short. I did not believe him a friend to the School. This conclusion was deduced from the following facts: I understood it had been stated during the fall of 1837, in Cincinnati, by Dr. Yandell, that Dr. Short would not remain in Lexington more than another winter—the conversations of Dr. Short with the students during the session of 1837-'38, as reported to me, imparted plausibility to this assertion, and a remark which he made in my presence in the Library at the close of a conversation in relation to the comparative advantages and prospects of the Lexington and Louisville schools, removed all doubt from my mind of its truth. With the mildness and modesty peculiar to him he rather plainly hinted that the advantages and prospects of the former were not so great and flattering as those of the latter, and when this opinion was rather earnestly opposed, he terminated the conversation by remarking "time will show." From the moment these words escaped his lips I determined to oppose every movement that should be made for his transfer to the chair of Theory and Practice. I was satisfied that no man with the sentiments he entertained could desire to remain in the Lexington if he had any hope of an invitation to join the Louisville school. My opposition was successful, but I ask the question, what would have been, in all probability, the result had it failed? In my humble judgment a fatal blow would have been inflicted upon the Institution. It was already in a precarious state, for we had lost Dr. Eberle by death, and had

Dr. Short deserted us, as I firmly believed that he would, even after being placed in the chair of Theory and Practice, the school would have been irrecoverably ruined. But this, my colleagues, blinded by passion and biased by prejudice, could not see. We had, and my old colleagues still have, an indefatigably industrious and a decidedly able rival in the Louisville Medical Institute to contend with, and I ask, is there a single human being out of the Transylvania Medical Faculty, so incurably stupid as to believe that had Dr. Short left us, after having been transferred to the chair of Theory and Practice, our enemies, at Louisville, would not have proclaimed, and with every appearance of plausibility, if not of truth, that the Transylvania Medical School was ruined beyond redemption—that it had lost two of its ablest men—one from death, and the other from desertion? Thus, by my foresight and management, I shielded the Institution a second time from a fatal blow, that the infatuation and folly of some of my colleagues were willing, and would no doubt have exposed it to.*

Mitchell in his statement says: "When it was announced that Dr. Eberle was no more, the ex-professor commenced his secret efforts to procure the vacant chair, and hearing that Dr. Short and myself were named as candidates, [the latter certainly by nobody but himself] he publicly denounced us to the class, as unfit for the place; called on the pupils to disown every thing of the sort, alledging that our appointment would disgrace the school, and consequently disgrace its pupils. *This, and more, I heard with my own ears, in the Chemical Hall, immediately below the place where this most brotherly harangue was made.* There are facts in abundance to prove that during the session named, he was perpetually endeavoring to depreciate the labors of his colleagues, and to elevate himself." I vainly and

foolishly thought I had in my *Appeal* so firmly nailed this counterfeit to the counter that he would never again attempt to foist himself into circulation, even where only a spurious coin circulated. But in this I was mistaken. He has still the assurance to look honest men in the face with the frantic and desperate hope that with

"His weapons holy saws of sacred writ,"

he may be rescued from the fathomless depths of contempt into which he is precipitately sinking, while he silently and secretly soliloquizes:

"Thus I clothe my naked villainy
With old odd ends stol'd forth of holy writ,
And seem a saint when worst I play the Devil."

Did I not believe that it would be wantonly provoking Providence I would suffer this hypocritical cheat and base counterfeit to pass for what he is worth, and that is what in algebra is called a negative quantity, something worth less than nothing. But this he has not permitted—he has rendered forbearance impossible—it would prove me incapable of conceiving a generous sentiment, or of performing a worthy action, were I even to wink at a reversal of the infallible and eternal dress of Divine wisdom by shrinking, when such an opportunity is presented, from the palpable exposure of a man who has stollen

"The livery of the court of heaven
To serve the Devil in."

Mitchell knows that in preferring the charge embodied in the above extract he was doing nothing more than revamping an old, exploded and a disgusting falsehood, that had been triumphantly refuted eight years ago. The conceiver is no more guilty than the shameless reproducer and propagator of a falsehood. But this Mitchell sticks at nothing—his soul, although he affects to be making ample prospective provision for it, is like that of the licentious Pedro Garcias which lay among the ducats in his leathern bag, is in his breeches pocket among the ragged bank notes that he has dunned out of the students, one of whom was never known to have a moments rest from his importunities so long as he owed him a cent. Indeed his cupidity is such that the telescopic shadow of a dollar in the moon would make him, Judas-like, betray his Saviour, even should he have transferred his homage and devotion, as every one believes he has, from the immaculate Being that suffered and died on the cross, to the maculate and poisonous reptile that glories in the name of B. W. Dudley. From the multitude of deponents who are hurrying to the witness-stand to pronounce the sentence of condemnation upon the retailer of this foul and infamous slander,

*The infamous Mitchell says that Dr. Short left the Medical School of Transylvania because he was unwilling to be associated with me, when he knows it was because he could not endure to remain in the same institution with his brother-in-law, Dr. Dudley, on account of his scandalous treachery towards men for whom he had respect, and in whom he had confidence, and this is proved by the fact that he voluntarily abandoned the former in a great emergency, and followed the latter when their prospects were, in the general estimation, any thing but bright or promising. Besides Dr. Short knew, or might have known, for Dr. Richardson informed me of it, that Dr. Dudley hated him with so deep and malignant a hatred, because he would not testify falsely on the occasion of the sacrifice of Drs. Caldwell, Yandell, and Cooke, that he refused to have any thing to do with presenting his name to the Board of Trustees on the 29th of April, 1837, when the faculty was reorganized. This was done, if I was correctly informed, by Dr. Richardson. Besides, if my informant did not mislead me, Dr. Short very rarely entered the house of Dr. Dudley after the day of the dissolution of the faculty. For this information I am indebted to an individual who also told me that after the resignation of Dr. Short, Dr. Dudley boasted that he had not suffered the former to enter his house except on extraordinary occasions, and then only for the sake of appearances. Dr. Short knows whether this is true or not.

who shall I summons first? Let us hear what Professor Lawson, his colleague, has to say on the subject:

MAYSVILLE, KY., August 20, 1838.

PROFESSOR CROSS—DEAR SIR:

The first charge which particularly demands my attention is, that during last winter, you played off a continuous round of manœuvring, and intrigue to entrap the students, and to use them in furtherance of your ambitious views; that you were as obsequious as the Janitor; and that you entered into schemes, to injure two of the Faculty.

These reckless and profligate assertions, bear the image of falsehood, on their front. All who were acquainted with your conduct, last winter, will unite in one general exclamation of contempt and indignation, upon reading these diabolical charges. That you attempted to manœuvre, or to entrap the students, for any purpose is, according to the best of my knowledge and belief, utterly false. Nothing of that character, was discovered last winter, and if not then, when and where was it made? By Dr. _____, in _____? Doubtless, it originated there, and like its author, is a tissue of meanness and falsehood. That "he was as obsequious as the Janitor," is an insignificant charge. Your intercourse with the students, so far as I observed, was open, familiar, and courteous, yet noble and dignified. I believe it is false that you entered into schemes, to injure two of your colleagues.

Again, you are charged with attempting, by the basest means, to obtain the chair of Theory and Practice. This charge, is as false as the heart of him who made it. At the time the memorial, signed by 163 students was circulated, you expressed publicly and privately, a desire to remain in your present chair.*

My recollection of your opinion is, that you did not believe that any of the professors should be transferred to that chair, that it should be reserved for some one not then in the school; but if any of the professors were to be transferred, you did not object to your claim being laid before the Trustees.

The charge, that you summoned pupils to Bacchanalian revels and plied those with wine that loved it, is at once, a libel on yourself, as well as the students. I neither saw, nor heard these revels spoken of, nor do I believe, they ever had an existence. I believe the 163 names were willingly and voluntarily signed.

When the balloting took place among the students, for a professor of Theory and Practice, I was absent, but on my return I was informed of the circumstance, and also that Professor Short

*A word of explanation in relation to this memorial. Immediately after the death of Professor Eberle, the transference of either Mitchell or Professor Short, to the chair of Theory and Practice, was spoken of, and the idea excited great dissatisfaction, and much opposition in the class. When this contemplated movement came to the knowledge of the students, a memorial requesting the Board of Trustees to transfer me to the chair of Theory and Practice, was, without any agency on my part, drawn up and circulated through a class of two hundred and twenty-seven students, the number of which that of 1837-'38 consisted; one hundred and sixty-three of whom signed it in the course of a few hours.

received but one vote. It was a matter of curiosity with us to know who this minority of one was, who could be so simple, as to wish Dr. Short to lecture on Theory and Practice.*

Of the letter complimentary to Professor Mitchell I know but little. As Dr. Short, however, signed the diplomas, as professor *pro tem.*, it would seem that he had claims over others, but no one seemed disposed to pay him that compliment. Your own lectures, were fewer in number than either of the others, but their character was such as to delight and instruct all who heard them. I think I risk nothing in saying, that they were received by the class as a desideratum.

The last sweeping denunciation which caps the climax is, that the fortunes of the school will be fatally sealed, if you are permitted to remain in it.

Fortunately for the school and yourself, the author of this *discovery* can have no agency in effecting your expulsion. The friends of the school prize too highly your services to listen to such an idle declaration. Doubtless the envious author of that paragraph, would delight to see one whom he cannot rival, removed farther from him.

In conclusion, permit me to say, that I believed your governing principle to have been to make yourself useful to the class. That such was the case last winter was obvious to all.

The general character of the charges which have been arrayed against you, proves that they must claim as their author an envious, desperate, disappointed, and uncompromising enemy; one who will not scruple to herald forth any charges which his corrupt nature can fabricate, and for which the English language can be a vehicle.

Yours, very respectfully,

L. M. LAWSON, M. D.

[From the Kentucky (Lex.) Gazette.]

We observed in the _____, of the 27th ult., a violent attack upon the character of Professor Cross. This article appears under the editorial head, but judging from its phraseology, as well as from public rumor, we have no doubt that Dr. _____ is the author of the article—and had he only heaped his slander and misrepresentations on Prof. Cross, the article would have passed unnoticed by us, as we know that gentleman is amply able to defend himself. But the author, not satisfied with his denunciations of Dr. Cross, has implicated, in his libellous productions, the 163 students that signed the memorial referred to, charging them with being his ready accomplices in crime, and compliments them by saying, before his personal appeals were successful, they were brutalized by bacchanalian revels in his own rooms. As we are a part of the students that signed the memorial, we feel it our duty to pronounce this charge a gross and palpable violation of truth, and should bring down upon the author of this illiberal and slanderous production the execration of the

*I trust Dr. Short will not suppose any feeling of hostility to him causes his name to appear in this publication in connexion with a matter that should be forgotten. If it should, however, give him dissatisfaction he ought to blame his *ci-devant* or rather *soi-disant* friend Mitchell for attempting to revive a stale and an exploded calumny.

whole community. The memorial originated with the students, and was voluntarily signed by them; and so far as we know, or are informed, it was voluntarily signed by all those whose signatures were to it. As to the charge of bacchanalian revels in Prof. Cross's rooms, it originated from the same foul source that has continued to pour a flood of falsehoods upon the friends of Transylvania ever since Dr. —— was expelled from the Institution. Who, but this old and hardened offender, would thus unfeeling drag innocent and unoffending young men before the public, and attempt to brand them with infamy? Dr. —— a day of fearful retribution is at hand, you may yet be undeceived, and find that all your wicked machinations will recoil upon your own head.

ALEX'R NICHOLSON,
DAVID WALKER,
J. B. COONS,
S. T. NEWMAN,
S. W. COONS,
A. M. MCKINNEY,
JOHN A. NORTH,
C. A. PINKNEY, M. D.,
JOHN G. BAKER,
WM. H. ATKINSON.
WM. B. WOOD,
PEYTON T. JOHNSON,
WM. CAMPBELL.

Dr. Samuel E. Evans, of West-Rushville, Richland township, Ohio, wrote on the 19th of August, 1838, on the same subject, in the following manner:

In relation to the *“memorial* got up last winter, praying the Board of Trustees to transfer Dr. Cross over any other member of the Faculty, after the decease of Dr. Eberle, to the Chair of Theory and Practice, I know all about it. I was one of the prime movers in that affair, as Drs. Short and Mitchell know; and whom I met, by invitation, with the late Mr. Gordon, of Mississippi, with my views frankly and openly given, explanatory of the causes which impelled me, with others, to project and prosecute it. *We parted satisfied with each other.* Professor Cross had nothing to do in effecting or ultimating the memorial in question, for when he understood that such was contemplated, he requested the attendance of six or eight of us, and at our meeting we were distinctly informed that he was *averse to occupying the vacated chair*; that he wished to remain neutral; and had no doubt the Trustees would make a suitable and efficient disposition of it. It was clearly understood, and by myself in particular—for I had on a previous occasion suggested his acceptance as the expressed wish of a majority of the Class—that he did not desire the Chair, but to remain where he was. No, my coadjutors will testify, he is totally absolved from any participation in its origin or conduct; indeed, it was a matter of surprise, when we presented him with the entreaty, he should direct it in the event of any of the Faculty seeking the vacancy, in his own favor. Such was the design of this famed memorial, and it was upon these terms alone that he consented to hold it as a check to the supposed aspirings of two of his colleagues, for whom he expressed a cherished personal regard, and only hostile in this, their pre-

sumed ambition; still declaring, as before, that it was for the best interest of Transylvania the Chair should be filled from abroad, by one of known reputation, whose name might balance the popularity lost in Dr. Eberle. I am free to say, that in nothing did the moral or professional standing of any member of the Faculty suffer by Dr. Cross, from expressions made by him in my presence, or in that of others with whom I held intercourse; and as that was very general and open, I should have been apprised of it had such been the fact. I therefore knowingly pronounce all the charges preferred against Professor Cross, the sessions above understood, of plotting with the students, false; that by him we were withdrawn from our studies to join in the glass, *therby* to subserve his ends, equally false; that never in my hearing, or my fellow-students, was the character of Drs. Mitchell and Short traduced or under-valued, for the promotion of this business in question, but that, on the contrary, he always spake as became their co-laborer in the same vine-yard, the friend and gentleman. And now a word or two touching the balloting spoken of by the class; for I was there, and must be acknowledged a competent witness—and moreover, a Teller for the occasion. It is asked, “upon what authority is the statement made?” I reply, *by my authority*, with the connected testimony of all present. Dr. Cross speaks truth when he says there was a note for him on his table, calling on him to perform the duties of the Chair of Theory and Practice; that he returned for answer, he could not meet them, and earnestly desiring that our votes might not, in the pending election, be thrown for him. I was the individual who penned that note, and, at the conclusion of his lecture, suspecting the autograph mine, he sent for me to stay their interference in the coming contest; to remain quiet, deeming it ill-advised and precipitate; that the Trustees, he was assured, would act wisely and for the general interest. Thus much for the ballot-box.

Dr. John James Speed, of Crawfordsville, Indiana, thus testifies:

In reference to the memorial gotten up by the Students and signed by 163 of them, the writer in the Journal remarks that, “in the midst of the plots of the Students, his active selfishness was busy at work, and scarcely had the accomplished Eberle descended to his tomb before Dr. Cross commenced howling like a hyena around his grave for the Chair of *Theory and Practice*.” A baser and more unprincipled charge than this could not be brought against the most abandoned wretch by the most unscrupulous falsifier. So far as one man can become acquainted with the sentiments of another, I am capable of knowing and fearlessly stating, that Prof. Cross positively objected to being placed in that Chair, stating his preference, decided preference, for the Chair which he then occupied; and is it not strange, if he desired the place—if he howled like a hyena around the grave of the accomplished Eberle for the Chair of Theory and Practice, that not even those who desired him to receive it should have heard and listened to his cry? If Prof. Cross desired the Chair, he was most successful in concealing it from his friends. Passing over a number of

remarks equally harsh and unfounded, the writer says: "Thus, by taking time by the forelock, by working without opposition, by making false statements to the pupils, and by *plying those that loved it with wine*, he succeeded in getting 163 names to his paper, and, after all this scheming and meanness with the entire game in his own hands, and without a competitor for the Chair, he has the effrontery to claim the memorial as an honor to him, and holds it up as a mark of disgrace to Prof. —." Here he is endeavoring to produce upon his readers the impression that the whole course of conduct of Dr. Cross was directed to securing the Chair of Theory and Practice—that every step he took, and every thought he uttered, tended toward the memorial praying his transfer to the Chair. He succeeded! I am one of those who assisted in getting up and dictating that memorial, and I deny that Prof. Cross knew of its existence or its contemplation till apprised by one of the Class. Here the writer has manifested the same malignant and unhallowed spirit, and the same reckless determination to crush, by any means, him whom he has just cause to dread.

Dr. James M. Dean, of Lynchburg, Tennessee, wrote me on the 1st August, 1838, on the same subject, to the following effect:

The memorial that is so much harped upon by Dr. — was got up from choice. The class was induced to believe that efforts were making to elevate Dr. — to the Chair of Theory and Practice. They were well aware of his incompetency and intended to prevent his appointment by every exertion; for this reason they got up the memorial to the Trustees, presenting to them their choice. These were the motives that induced me to sign the memorial, and these the motives that al expressed that I saw sign it. With regard to the statement made by Dr. —, that you made efforts, assisted and influenced the students to get up the memorial, I pronounce to be an unfounded falsehood. I well recollect the circumstances under which the memorial was got up. I also recollect the substance of the response you gave to the note which was placed on your table, asking you to accept the Chair of Theory and Practice. You stated that you were opposed to being appointed—that the Chair you then occupied required your whole attention. You also stated that the Chair of Theory and Practice was the most important Chair that belonged to the Institution, and would be a greater inducement to a man of talents than any other Chair. Your answer to the note was satisfactory, showing that you did not desire the appointment, and that you did not want the School to loose talents by your elevation.

The following is an extract from a letter of the 11th September, 1838, written to me by Dr. H. King, of Greensborough, Georgia:

Your deportment last winter, instead of being low and vulgar, was considered extremely dignified and gentlemanly. Though repeatedly at your apartments alone, and in the company of other members of the class, I can conscientiously say, I never heard you give utterance to a single expres-

sion calculated to injure any one of your colleagues in the estimation of the class; on the contrary, when you spoke of them, it was always in terms of commendation. The morning of the day on which the balloting took place, in answer to a note, requesting you to lecture on Theory and Practice, you earnestly entreated your friends, in the presence of the whole class, not to cast their votes in your favor. In regard to your agency in getting up the memorial signed by 163 of the students, and the disreputable means said to be employed by you, I am prepared, from personal knowledge, to say that in no respect does the — speak the truth. On the subject of your standing with the class, it could not have been better. Your Chair was filled with distinguished honor to yourself, and to the entire satisfaction of the Class.

Yours, with great esteem,

H. KING.

Testimony in refutation of the allegation that I desired the chair of Theory and Practice after the death of Professor Eberle, and that I attempted to injure the standing of my colleagues with the students during the session of 1837-'38, could be increased to any extent, for the above has been selected from what was furnished me by at least fifty individuals all of whom were competent to testify. The number and character of the witnesses I have summoned will be regarded, I trust, as fully sufficient to satisfy the doubts of the most scrupulous or incredulous.* But Mitch-

*That I did at any time, either during the session above referred to or since, intrigue with the students for the purpose of injuring the standing of any colleague I ever had in the Transylvania Medical School or attempted by any means to defraud him of his popularity is foully and grossly false. Never in my private and social intercourse with the students, nor in the public discharge of my official duties did I drop an expression that did not breathe respect for them as men and confidence in them as to their. Of some of them I truly, indeed, I may say I never expressed an opinion in the presence of the students. I had nothing good to say of them, and to have spoken disparagingly would have been not only to injure the school but to have acted in violation of a ruling principle of my conduct. No bitterness of hostility could provoke me to this while I remained in the Institution. In confirmation of the truth of all I have said in this note I appeal to the classes to whom I have lectured in the Transylvania Medical School. No individual who belonged to either of them, will say he ever thought the less of any colleague I ever had on account of any personal or didactic remarks to which I gave utterance, with the exception perhaps of Dr. Dudley. If ever said any thing of him that limited his influence or impaired his standing with the classes, it was exclusively of the latter character. In consequence of daily wandering out of his department, and for what purpose no one could ever guess except it was to betray his ignorance, into that of mine, and he invaded those of some of his other colleagues almost as frequently, I was compelled to handle some of his opinions rather roughly. But even when this was the case it was never done in connexion with his name, and if a stranger had come into the lecture-room while I was engaged in the refutation of one of his ridiculous vagaries of fancy, he would not have known whether the author of it lived in the United States or in Europe, so strictly did I forbear making any personal allusion. The students, however, knew to whom I referred, for they, perhaps, had heard him lecture on the same subject not twenty-four hours before. As an honest man and a faithful teacher it was impossible for me to shrink from the responsibility of teaching what I believed to be the truth, although Dr. Dudley might happen to differ with me in opinion. I never

all eyes-dropped it as he has had the graceless effrontery to admit, and asserts upon the authority of information thus disreputably acquired that "This, and more, I heard with my own ears in the Chemical Hall, immediately below the place where this brotherly harangue was made." If what this reckless impostor says be true, which, however, is utterly impossible, then are his colleague Professor Lawson and the crowd of witnesses I have summoned and examined low, vulgar, and suborned liars. Who believes this? No body but Mitchell, and he should be hissed out of all company for uttering the gratuitous calumny. He knew it was a lie when he uttered it, and knew also that his colleague would testify against him.

It is very painful to be brought, under any circumstances, into collision with men, who, while they are incapable of placing a just value upon others show that they have no respect for themselves. Degraded beyond the hope of redemption in their own estimation, as they have been long since in that of every man of sense or sensibility, they think they have full license to slander and malign in the fact, that no one will condescend to contradict them or compromit his honor by holding them to a strict accountability. As a general rule, Mitchell, being as he is, a star of the first magnitude among men who belong to this category, might confidently reckon upon being suffered to indulge, unmolested, the vicious propensities of his nature. Had he not been my colleague, I would not flatter him by making another remark. But even this circumstance, together with the provoking manner in which he has tried to insult me on a point susceptible of satisfactory refutation, will not excuse me I fear, for what I feel inclined to add in relation to him. My reputation, as a teacher, is almost as dear to me as the blood that gurgles through the arteries of my heart. The scrupulous reader will, therefore, I trust, excuse me, should he think I am giving too much time and devoting too much attention to a work of supererogation. "A stranger might suppose," says Mitchell, "that *he* (Cross) was the very soul of the Institution, that it had its being in him, when in truth, his teaching as well as his example was all the while exerting a pernicious influence on

the profession." Without claiming more than respectability as a teacher, which I might without being charged with arrogance or presumption, if the profession at large knew Mitchell as well as those do who are or have been immediately around him, it would be regarded as a sufficient response to this ebullition of slander to say that, with the exception of Dr. Rush, he was never known to speak in other than the most disparaging terms of his colleagues or men of distinction in the profession. He is incapable of the conception of a liberal thought, or the performance of a generous action. Restless, unquiet, and miserable at the moderate but just estimate which the profession, so far as he is known to it, has placed upon his abilities and learning, and the mortifying reflection that no labor can raise him to a high degree of intellectual eminence, have made him an Ishmaelite. The humble position fate has decreed him to occupy amongst men of reputation and importance, has rendered him as dissatisfied and querulous as an old maid verging on the desperation of six and thirty. But thus it is with those in whose bosoms the fires of ambition burn, but who, unfortunately, have not more capacity than fits them for the humblest intellectual functions of vulgar life.

"Base envy withers at another's joy
And hates the excellence it cannot reach."

Mitchell instead of repining at the decrees of Providence, should recollect that talents, like the spirit of Owen Glendower, though conjured with even so loud a voice, "Yet will not come when you call for them."

With the request that the reader will refer to p. 43 of my Appeal and p. 10 of this work, for what illustrates the point under consideration, I take the liberty of adducing the testimony of Peter as about a fair counterbalance of what his co-slanderer has uttered. In the midst of the difficulties that ultimately led to my resignation, and when of course I was still a member of the Faculty, he said, in an article in response to one previously published by Dr. Pinckard, "In conclusion, I will repeat that, so far as the Faculty of the Medical Department can judge, *we never had more reason to be proud of our Institution.*"* This was

*But such declarations amount to very little, they are stereotyped expressions of the Transylvania Faculty.—When the School was re-organized in 1837, the Chairman of the Board of Trustees said to the public, "Such are the men who now compose the Medical Faculty of Transylvania University—such are the teachers we present to the public in redemption of our pledge," which was that the School should be made stronger than it was before the dissolution. When Dr. Smith succeeded Dr. Eberle in Theory and Practice, it was asserted in the public prints that it had never been so efficient at any former period. When Dr. Bartlett succeeded Dr. Smith in the same chair, it was said the School was stronger than ever; when Dr. Watson was appointed to the Chair of Theory and Practice it was publicly asserted that the School was infinitely stronger; and now having an equivocal assurance that Dr. Bartlett will take his "old Chair," in the "Statements of Fact," it

went out of my department to attack his views, while he, every winter, consumed much time unprofitably in the discussion of subjects of a speculative nature that did not belong to him. This time would have been much more usefully employed in the teaching of surgery, upon which he never gave any thing like a complete course of lectures in his life. Of this the classes constantly complained, and Dr. Richardson was wont to say that he believed one of the principal reasons why Dr. Dudley was so unwilling to relinquish one of his chairs, consisted in the fact that his knowledge of surgery was not sufficiently thorough and comprehensive to enable him to lecture upon it six times a week for four months in succession.

grossly false, if one of its members was such a man as they now represent me to be. In the letter of Professor Lawson, already quoted, (p 21) he says in relation to the lectures on Theory and Practice, which I delivered in the winter of 1837-38, after the death of Dr. Eberle, "Your own lectures, were fewer in number, than either of the others, but their character was such as to delight and instruct all who heard them. I think I risk nothing in saying that they were received by the Class as a desideratum." Again, he said, and much more recently, "Professor Cross who justly ranks among the ablest medical philosophers and writers of the age, has kindly consented to become a correspondent of the *Lancet*." One of the ablest writers and most distinguished teachers in the United States, wrote me as follows;—"That you should be slandered is not at all surprising, you have enemies, and they will spare no pains to injure you. If you were a man of a more passive or negative character, this would probably not be the case; but you have talents, energy and reputation, and are therefore a fair target for the malevolent shafts of those whose interest or desire it is to impair your influence and standing. Your character as a teacher and writer is well established, and my opinion is, that the Lexington School has no particular cause to congratulate itself upon your resignation."

The pupils of the two Institutions in which I have taught, are now the Physicians of the West and South, and being uninfluenced by undue prejudice or partiality, are doubtless the most competent judges of my claims as a teacher. The following notices are taken, at random, from a great mass of testimony of the same import, which, if adduced, would occupy space without rendering the refutation of the charge preferred against me, more complete or successful. "Dr. Cross is well known to the Medical world as a teacher and writer of the first grade. His mind is keen and analysing: he separates facts from theory—the real from the imaginary—building upon the solid basis of experience and observation."—*Boonslick (Missouri) Democrat*. "Professor Cross is well known throughout the Valley of the Mississippi, as one of the most able and eloquent teachers now laboring in the cause of medical instruction."—*Shawneetown*

is said that "The friends of the School are assured, that at no point in her (I suppose the Transylvania Medical School is meant) history has she offered such strong claims upon their patronage as she does at present." Having found that the frequent changes in the Chair of Theory and Practice have been productive of so much invigoration, it is wonderful that the Trustees have not suggested the propriety of imparting strength to the Institution in a reduplicating ratio, by effecting changes in some of the other departments—the Chemical for example, as the risk of the experiment would not be great, nor would it cost much.

(Ill.) *Republican* "As a lecturer, Professor Cross stands unrivalled in popularity, and may be deemed the pillar of Transylvania University."—*Edgewood (S. C.) Advertiser*. The moment it was ascertained that I was appointed to a Chair in the Medical School at Memphis, Tennessee, the following complimentary notices appeared in two Tennessee Journals—the first in the *Standard*, and the second in the *Tribune*. The writer remarks: "In running my eye over the list of Professors I find the name of James Conquest Cross; it is a host in itself, and its weight will be felt sensibly at Lexington, Louisville, Cincinnati and St. Louis. Dr. Cross is extensively known, particularly in the West and South, as one of the most successful medical teachers in the United States.—Being a man of great labor, erudition and genius, he will at once give the School a respectable standing." "At the head of the list (of the Professors of the Memphis School) we find the name of James Conquest Cross. It would be useless to say one word in relation to the character of this gentleman as a Medical Philosopher or Teacher. He is well known in this State: and not only here, but wherever great men are known. He is an independent Medical Philosopher—while he pays proper regard to the opinions of others, thinks for himself. He was at one time Professor of Materia Medica and Therapeutics in the Medical College of Ohio, after which he was Professor of the Institutes of Medicine and Medical Jurisprudence in the Transylvania Medical College at Lexington.—With due respect for those who filled the different Chairs in that University, I must be permitted to say that I viewed him as the brightest star in the galaxy. As an independent (and generally correct) Medical Philosopher and practical teacher, James Conquest Cross, has not a superior."* The indeli-

* I may add, I trust, without offence, that the conduct of my late colleagues was anything else than a confirmation of the opinion expressed by them of me as a teacher in the "Statements of Facts." No public effort was ever to be made on behalf of the Institution, that was not devoted to me. When we lost Professor Eberle, I was selected to pronounce his eulogy; when the new Medical Edifice was to be dedicated, I was summoned to the rostrum; when the Medical Convention of Kentucky met in Frankfort in the winter of 1841-42, I was appointed in conjunction with Dr. Dudley, to represent the Transylvania Medical School in it; was elected by the Convention one of its Vice-Presidents; was invited by and did lecture to the Convention on the "Antiquity of the Earth;" and was afterwards appointed to deliver the annual address when it should meet in the winter of 1842-43. During the whole of the session of the Convention, Dr. Dudley's lips were hermetically sealed, he leaving me to cope in all the discussions, and they were numerous, that arose single-handed with Professors Caldwell, Drake and Yandell. When it is recollected that it was believed the deliberations of the Convention would have a very important influence on the future prospects of the Schools of Lexington and Louisville, this was entrusting me with a very responsible duty. When Committees of the Legislature or distinguished strangers

eacy of parading such notices before the public is obvious, and the impolicy and impropriety of it, except under very peculiar circumstances, very great. That these exist on the present occasion, I think the reader will readily admit, and this consideration will, I trust, induce him to regard my conduct with indulgence. Perhaps I ought to have felt secure in the judgment and decision of those to whom I have given instruction, rather than have given the malicious an excuse to charge me with arrogance or egotism.

What Mitchell has said of my conduct towards, and feelings for, Dr. Bush, is ungraced by a single sentiment of honor, for it is known to several individuals to be not only gratuitous and unfounded, but maliciously false. On this point, after the production of a single document with an explanation of the circumstances that gave rise to it, I will turn him over to the tender mercies of those whom he has wantonly abused and deceived, or betrayed and slandered. At the time the memorial was circulated in the Class of 1843-44, to which I have already referred at p. 15, 16 of my *Appeal*, and which had for its object the removal of Dr. Bush, it was stated by those immediately around Drs. Dudley and Bush, that I was the instigator or author of it. This was wholly false, and as I had never made an extemporeous explanation to the Class without its being misrepresented, I drew up the following paper, to exclude the possibility of misconstruction on the subject, and read it to the Class. Previously, in the Faculty-room, I had read it to Mitchell.

"GENTLEMEN: My name has been connected, I understand, with a memorial that has been circulated in the Class, in relation to the Adjunct Professor of Anatomy. This I wish to say is wholly unauthorized. Conscious from the peculiar circumstances of my position, that my motives would be, as they have heretofore been, misrepresented. I must be permitted to assure you that I am the last man in the Faculty, who would do any thing calculated to disturb the harmony of the Faculty—that of the Class or that would expose my motives to misconstruction. From a proper degree of responsibility, I never will shrink whenever a proper subject shall be brought before me, in my official capacity, for deliberation, and when I decline action under other circumstances, it is either because I feel no interest in the matter, or because I hold it to be incompatible with my relations to my colleagues, and the obligations I am under to the Institution in which I am a teacher."

visited the Institution, they were detained in the Library and Museum until the clock struck eleven, when they were hurried in to my lecture-room, where they remained until I and Dr. Bartlett had lectured. The design of this manoeuvre, the most stupid can understand. Indeed, I am convinced I had colleagues that no Committee of the Legislature ever heard give a single lecture, at least, while I was in the Institution.

LEXINGTON, September 13, 1846.

DR. CROSS—DEAR SIR: In looking over a pamphlet entitled "*Statements of Facts*," in relation to the expulsion of James Conquest Cross from Transylvania University, the joint production of Professors Dudley, Mitchell and Peter, I ask the privilege in your forthcoming publication, to correct some misrepresentations and falsehoods therein contained. Dr. Mitchell in his statement, says:—"As he (Dr. Cross) and his tools have made much ado about Dr. Bush, I may say here, that all the difficulty and objection to Dr. B., that I ever heard, originated with him, (1 r. C.) and those under his influence, &c." Now as it is generally known that I am the author of the articles that appeared in the *Lexington Inquirer*, during the months of April and May 1844, I feel called on by the base falsehoods of Dr. Mitchell, to state the facts in relation to the origin of the attempt made by me, in 1844, to re-organize the Medical Department of Transylvania University.

From the time the School was reorganized in 1837, I took a deep interest in its prosperity. This is well known to many of the Physicians and most respectable citizens of Lexington, as well as to some of the present Professors. Being my Alma Mater, I was particularly desirous that it should not be surpassed in respectability and usefulness, by any School in the great Valley. From year to year, complaints were made that Dr. Bush was incompetent to teach Anatomy, and that Dr. Dudley for want of time, was unable to give as full a course of instruction on Anatomy and Surgery as was given in the Schools of Medicine at Louisville and Cincinnati. In the spring of 1843, I accidentally met with Dr. Mitchell in Dr. Kirby's office, and mentioned to him the complaints that were made against Dr. Bush by the students, and also stated to him that the physicians considered him incompetent, and that the School was suffering much injury from the fact that Dr. Dudley held two professorships. He concurred fully in all I had said, and remarked, that the evils complained of, ought to be speedily remedied by a re-organization. He spoke so earnestly and sensibly on the subject of the defects of the School, that I was fully persuaded he was correct, when he asserted that unless they were removed, "the School must go down." When I asked him if nothing could be done to avert its threatened ruin, he responded, that he thought not, for Dr. Dudley was inflexibly resolved to retain possession of two professorships, and that he would not suffer Dr. Bush to be turned out. The latter, he denounced in a manner that has never yet been presented to the public—he complained of the undue influence that Dr. Dudley exercised over the Board of Trustees—said ineffectual efforts had been made by himself and others to induce Dr. Dudley to agree to a re-organization.

This conversation with Dr. Mitchell (and he is the first Professor I ever spoke to in relation to the defects of the School) made a deep impression upon my mind and produced the conviction that a re-organization was absolutely necessary. From a sense of duty to the profession and a desire to protect the interests of Lexington, I determined at once to use every effort to avert the threatened ruin of our School, but soon ascertained that no

thing could be done so long as it surpassed the Schools of Cincinnati and Louisville in the number of its pupils, and therefore said but little on the subject until the next session, that of 1843-'44, when it was found that it had fallen considerably in the rear of the Louisville Medical Institute, and barely numbered as many pay students as were to be found in the Medical College of Ohio. This, I state, on the authority of Dr. Mitchell. The students being clamorous during the session of 1843-'44 for a re-organization, and believing, from what Dr. Mitchell said to me in the spring of 1843, that a majority of the Faculty were dissatisfied, not even excepting Drs. Bartlett and Peter, (though the former was too prudent and the latter too politic to commit themselves,) I determined to approach the late Dr. Richardson on the subject. He fully concurred with his colleague, Prof. M., as to the necessity of a re-organization, but, not being able to advise me how to proceed to effect it, discouraged the attempt. The next day after my interview with Prof. R., I met Dr. Cross on my way to his house and immediately introduced the subject of the defects of the School. He was very reserved, and, although I informed him of the opinions of Drs. Mitchell and Richardson, he declined giving any opinion on the subject at that time. I proposed that Drs. R., M., and himself should represent the defects of the School to the Trustees; to this he positively objected, and said that any move of that kind would be attributed to him, in consequence of the equivocal relations that subsisted between Drs. Dudley and Bush and himself. Besides, he said the School might go down, for none of the efforts he had made for it had been appreciated or attended to. He advised me not to interfere with the re-organization unless I could procure the co-operation of the Trustees, and that he thought impossible, as they would be unwilling to do anything without the consent of Dr. Dudley—but concurred fully with Drs. M. and R. in regard to the defects of the School.

I had no further conversations with any of the Professors on the subject until after the publication of my first article, and before a line of it was written Dr. Cross had gone East. On the day of its appearance Dr. Mitchell was at the office of Dr. Darby and expressed himself freely—saying that the positions taken by "A Friend to Lexington" were correct. When informed that Dr. Peter intended answering it, he seemed much dissatisfied, and, after his article appeared, he complained particularly of the defence set up for Dr. Bush, and informed my friends that, in my rejoinder, I was at liberty to say that Dr. Peter formerly thought with a majority of the Faculty, both in relation to the incompetency of Dr. Bush and the injury which the School was sustaining from Dr. Dudley's holding two professorships, and it was on his authority that these statements were made. After the controversy commenced, Dr. Mitchell was in the habit of visiting Dr. Darby's office for the purpose, as I believed, of communicating, for my benefit, anything which he thought would aid in effecting a re-organization. During the publication of the first three or four of my articles, Dr. Cross was from home, and both Drs. Richardson and Mitchell wrote to him to return home immediately for the purpose of aiding them in the proposed re-organization, when the matter should be

brought before the Trustees, which they (Drs. R. and M.) determined should be done unless Dr. Dudley should agree to resign one of his professorships, and to the removal of Dr. Bush.

Dr. Peter, in the "Statements of Facts," says "the next issue of the *Inquirer* brought another of the ignobrious articles of the 'Friend to Lexington,' in which was a garbled and distorted account of this Faculty meeting—a meeting at which none but the Faculty were present and the proceedings of which were known to none but the Faculty. This publication at once identified Dr. Cross with the nefarious publications which done so much injury to the Institution; proved him a traitor to the School," &c.* Now the following are the facts in regard to my means of information in relation to the proceedings of the Faculty: The meeting to which Dr. Peter refers took place on Friday, the 17th of May, and the next publication day of the *Inquirer* was the following Tuesday, the 21st of May. Dr. Mitchell had previously informed my friends that at this meeting very important action might be expected on the part of the majority of the Faculty—that Dr. Dudley was expected to resign one of his Chairs, as he had been requested by a majority of the Faculty. I, of course, was very anxious to know the result of this meeting, as I was preparing an article to press forward the re-organization for the *Inquirer* of the next Tuesday. I therefore repaired to Dr. Darby's office before bed-time, supposing Dr. Mitchell would call there, as was his custom, on his return from the Faculty room, and communicate to us the result of the meeting. He did not come, however, as usual, and a little after 10 o'clock I returned home. The next morning I again called at Dr. Darby's, and, not finding him in, was about returning, when I met Dr. Mitchell in the street. I asked him about the meeting of the Faculty of the evening before, when he, without hesitation, informed me that Dr. Dudley had refused to resign either of his Chairs, although he had two evenings before professed his willingness to his colleagues to do anything for the interest of the School—that they had accordingly passed resolutions, by a majority of three to one, requesting him to resign one of his professorships which resolutions had been sent to him—that the Faculty had met, expecting him to send in his resignation, but, instead of that, he had appeared in person and refused to comply unless Dr. Bush was appointed to the vacant Chair, and, as that could only make the School weaker, Dr. Cross had proposed to let things remain in *status quo*—that Dr. Peter had had the assurance to propose that the members of the Faculty should oppose "A Friend to Lexington," by denying the truth of what he had published, which he (Dr. M.) indignantly resented by asking Dr. Peter if he wished the Faculty to deny the truth. Dr. Mitchell took great credit to himself for his boldness and independence in this matter. The whole of the above facts he not only communicated to me without hesitation, but stated them more than once, that I might not misrepresent

*The insolence of Peter is perfectly insufferable. After having proved conclusively on p. 16, 17 of my *Appeal* that it was utterly impossible for me to have had any agency in the articles published by Dr. Pinckard during my absence from Lexington, he has the effrontery still to identify me with them.

them in my next publication, which appeared on the following Tuesday, (the 21st of May.) It was Dr. Mitchell and not Dr. Cross who communicated to me the proceedings of the Faculty, and I feel called on to make this statement in order to free a much-injured individual from the slanderous imputations cast on him by Dr. Peter in what they falsely call "Statements of Facts."

T. B. PINCKARD, M. D.

LEXINGTON, Ky., 22d September, 1846.

DR. CROSS—*Dear Sir:* As Dr. Mitchell has thought proper, without excuse, to refer to my office in a most offensive manner, and has impliedly laid upon my shoulders charges made against him by others, I feel bound to give the following testimony as to what he did say in my office, and under what circumstances he was there. Dr. Mitchell knows very well that what he thought proper to say to me, and in my presence, was not at my seeking, but of his own accord, unasked by me.

J. C. DARBY, M. D.

"DEAR DOCTOR: In reply to the interrogatories contained in your letter of the 12th of September, I would state, that I was a student in your office during the spring and summer of 1844. Until the publications of Dr. Pinckard commenced, Dr. Mitchell was not in the habit of visiting your office; but from the commencement of said publications, he did not, to the best of my knowledge, miss being in your office one single evening on which Dr. Pinckard's articles were to make their appearance. His anxiety was so great that I have known him to go to the printing-office two or three times to get the proof sheet; this he would read aloud in your office, correct it, laugh heartily over it, and make suggestions as to what might have been inserted. I have known him to do this not only in your presence, but in that of Dr. Pinckard, and I think of Dr. Lewis and others. He would frequently call in the forenoon and sit for an hour or more, during which time his conversation scarcely ever varied from the Medical School—the propriety of Dr. Dudley's resigning the Chair of Anatomy, and the election of a competent man, &c. He approved of everything Dr. Pinckard said, and hesitated not to denounce Dr. Bush as &c., and Dr. Dudley as a perfect tyrant. [I omit the strong expressions which Dr. Robinson says Dr. Mitchell used in reference to Dr. Bush, as I have no object in having them repeated.]

"One would infer that Dr. Mitchell was quite familiar in your office, from the fact that about the time he was negotiating with Dr. Watson to take the Chair of Theory and Practice in Transylvania University, I knew him to bring Dr. Watson's letters to your office and read quotations to you and others, to convince you that he was a man of talents.

"Dr. Mitchell certainly made the matter of the difficulty in the School more public than either Dr. Cross* or Dr. Richardson, for he would frequently speak of what was done at the Faculty meetings, a thing I never heard either Dr. Cross or Dr. Richardson do. If Dr. Mitchell denies the above he is certainly not incapable of denying anything.

Yours, respectfully,

G. P. ROBINSON, M. D.

Near Louisville, 20th Sept., 1846."

The "Statements of Facts" make the broad assertion that I was expelled from the Medical Faculty of Transylvania University. A brief examination will convince the reader that this infamous allegation so far from resting, as it should, upon grounds of direct probatum, has not been invested by the *Trio* with even the plausibility of a special pleaders sophistry. Let us see, in the first place, what they have said in relation to the origin of the letter of requisition to resign. Both Mitchell and Peter charge this upon Dr. Richardson. This they can now do with perfect safety, for he is dead, and unfortunately has not left a single colleague who has honesty enough to keep from slandering him, and no one who has any interest or inclination to shield his name from reproach. The fact that both of them repudiate the suggestion of the letter requesting me to resign, and attempt to throw it upon Dr. Richardson, proves conclusively that they think it a most disgraceful transaction, and hope to escape some of the odium necessarily attached to it by claiming to have been mere participants in, rather than the authors of it. Now had their conduct been just or creditable, they would have squabbled amongst themselves for the honor and credit of originating the suggestion, rather than seek to charge it upon the dead, in whose defense no word could have been said by any one but themselves, had not accident placed it in my power to prove that Dr. Richardson was no more to blame, if, indeed, he was as much as a certain other individual who has a fair chance of going down to the grave as a most infamous and reckless liar. To me, it is of no consequence whatever who originated the letter of requisition, and although I have but little interest in defending the memory of Dr. Richardson from the slanders of his quondam friends and associates, I feel bound to say on the authority of a letter received by me a few weeks ago, while in Cincinnati, that Mr.—had asserted that when Dr. Richardson understood he had been accused of suggesting the letter of requisition, he not only denied it positively, but charged it upon Mitchell.*—Now it is plain, that although Mitchell and

*The name of the individual referred to, is suppressed, in consequence of the reception of the following note from Dr. Darby since my arrival in Louisville:—"I called on _____, and mentioned to him what you had to say of Dr. Richardson on his authority. He is not willing that his name should be referred to. I endeavored to show him the propriety of doing so in justice to Dr. R., but he declined: said that what he said to me was in confidence, and that he did not wish to appear to be participating in the controversy. I hope you will see the propriety of not referring to _____, now that he has *positively refused*,—I cannot consent to your doing so." The suppression of the name of the individual alluded to, does not effect the truth or importance of the fact, for he is a man of high intelligence and great respectability, and I have no doubt, if it were absolutely indispensable, he would permit his name to be used.

Peter have taken great pains to exculpate Dr. Dudley, and to repudiate the infamous act themselves, the public is as far as ever from knowing upon whom should be reflected the honor of authorship. There is, however, one fact which conclusively proves that all that has been asserted by Mitchell and Peter, as to the origin and cause of the letter of requisition is a gross and clumsy fabrication. Mitchell says: "The proposition came from the late Dr. Richardson, as a means of averting an act of expulsion on the part of the Trustees, which Dr. R. declared to be in contemplation." And Peter asserts "That Dr. Richardson having understood that the Board of Trustees were about to take the case of Dr. C. into consideration, called on Dr. Mitchell and proffered to him, as the best mode of preventing the probable expulsion of Dr. Cross, that the Faculty should request him to resign." The reader will recollect, that Dr. Richardson denied having suggested the letter of requisition, and here let him observe, that Mitchell and Peter say he recommended it in consequence of what he had learned were the intentions of the Trustees in relation to me. Observe also, how carefully both of them avoid saying that they had ever heard any such intimation. The reason is very obvious—they could safely blame Dr. Richardson with it, but had they asserted on their own authority, that the Trustees had any such intention, the proof would have been required, and this they could not have produced. Moreover, is it not very remarkable that Dr. Richardson should have been the only member of the Faculty who had heard any thing of the intentions of the Trustees? If further testimony were wanting, to prove that the statements of Mitchell and Peter are not only grossly false, but a foul and infamous slander upon the memory of Dr. Richardson, it is to be found in the fact that never until the "Statements of Facts" appeared, was it ever hinted that the letter of requisition resulted from an intimation that the Trustees designed expelling me from the Faculty. I have made extensive inquiries on this subject personally, and through my friends, since the appearance of the "Statements of Facts," and find that this is a perfectly novel version of the affair—no one ever having heard of it before. No matter what Mitchell and Peter may have said to the contrary, I am perfectly satisfied that Dr. Dudley gave the cue, and they, like the sheep of Panurgus caught it. Obviously the work of fancy, like Jonah's gourd, which sprang up in one night, it was invented after the appearance of my *Appeal*, and after too, it was found to be impossible to remain silent. This is almost as evident as an axiom in Euclid. This, therefore, taken in connexion

with the fact stated by Dr. Lewis at p. 17 and 28 of my *Appeal*, proves conclusively that both Mitchell and Dr. Richardson had a better and more persuasive reason for writing me the letter of requisition than is to be found in the new version given by the former and Peter—they were obliged to do it as Prentice remarks: "to save their own necks."

This Mitchell, who, in his language and manners, shows that he is as ignorant of the common courtesies of genteel society, as a filthy and offensive Hottentot, and who, besides has habitually given such unbridled license to his tongue, that his name is generally mentioned with the complimentary cognomen of "the liar," has the insolent effrontery to persist in and reiterate the charge, that I employed the Hon. H. Clay and the Hon. A. K. Wooley, to have the request of the Faculty revoked. The reader will refer to the letters of those gentlemen, to be found at page 46 of my *Appeal*, and then read the following vulgar tirade of Mitchell:—"And in regard to any letter imputed to me, touching the *expulsion* of the Professor, (for, so his friends called it here,) [a greater untruth was never penned, and I defy him to mention any friend of mine who ever used such an expression] I have only to say that my written statement of the interviews with Judge Wooley, made at the time, and a note having the signature of a more distinguished gentleman, fully justify every iota contained in that letter. And lest there should be any misconception on this point, I now aver distinctly, that the Ex-Professor was required to quit the Faculty, and that he *substantially* and *virtually*, did employ the instruments referred to, in order to have the Faculty act revoked." This proverbial falsifier, has the impudence to start a question of veracity between himself and Messrs. Clay and Wooley, and it was doubtless *only* from sheer modesty that he did not give them the lie direct—indeed it looks very much as if he had—but the "hungry will dare any thing." With this I have nothing to do, further than to say he has told a most unpardonable falsehood, and when the character of the witnesses, whose veracity he has impudently impugned is considered, the public will say so also.

There is also a question of veracity between Peter and Judge Wooley on the subject. The former asserts, that "we (the Faculty) were visited individually by Judge Wooley, who came on the part of Dr. Cross, and interceded for him," while Judge Wooley tells me in his letter, that "You consulted me as a friend, and I determined, *without your knowledge*, to have conversations with the Professors, and ascertain, if practicable, if any honorable adjustment could be effected."

When the public reflects that Messrs. Clay and Wooley could be influenced by no other motive than a desire to state the truth, while Mitchell and Peter had every reason that could operate on the hearts of dishonest men to induce them to *lie*, it will not pause or hesitate a single moment in relation to who should be believed.

A letter purporting to be from the Hon. H. Clay, and addressed to Dr. Dudley, finds a place in the "*Statements of Facts*," but for what reason I am sure no one can tell, unless it is for the purpose of throwing discredit upon the statement made to me by him in his note of the 29th June 1844, just referred to, and perhaps also to intimate to the public that he is a man unentitled to belief.

I might, with propriety, ask if this letter is a forgery, for Mr. Clay gives the reader clearly to understand, in his letter to me of the 29th June, 1844, that all the agency he had in the matter was one interview with Dr. Dudley, and that was prompted by his own feelings. But this idea is utterly incredible, for reckless as the infamous *Trio* evidently are, it would be absurd and preposterous to suppose that they would dare to take so unauthorized a liberty with the name of so distinguished a man. How then are we to account for its publication? It was evidently confidential, and the conduct of the authors of the "*Statements*" proves this conclusively. This letter was addressed to Dr. Dudley, but in his statement he does not drop even a hint that he has any knowledge of its existence; Mitchell seems to know there is such a letter, and evidently alludes to it; but Peter, to whom it was not addressed, and who seems not to think it necessary to tell us how he obtained possession of it, without heralding it with excuse or apology spreads it before the public. Now what is the inference? Why that Dr. Dudley, to whom the letter was addressed, knew that if he were to publish it he would be denounced as guilty of an outrage that no man of honor would ever pardon; and therefore foolishly supposed that by suffering Peter to do what he knew would forever disgrace him, should he do it himself, he would escape all blame or responsibility. What wretched umbrella morality!

*That the letter of Mr. Clay was confidential there cannot be a doubt, for when I was in Cincinnati superintending the printing of my *Appeal*, Dr. Bush stated on Cheapside, in this city, in the presence of several individuals, that there was such a letter in existence, but that it was confidential—that last winter Mitchell urged the propriety of publishing it, but Dr. Dudley indignantly remarked to him that it was confidential, and that he must never again mention the name of Mr. Clay, or that letter, in connexion with my leaving the school. This was said in the presence of those who, it was known would inform me of it immediately, and it was said for a two-fold purpose. It was intended to impress the public mind with an exalted idea of Dr. Dudley's honor and magnanimity, for although he had a document in

But confidential or not, I ask what does the letter of Mr. Clay prove? Nothing more than that he *feared I had acted indiscreetly*. This I have admitted, and I gave in my *Appeal* a fair and candid account of the circumstance referred to, although one of the *Trio* has the assurance to denounce it as fraudulent, but prudently refrains from attempting to prove it to be so.* Why did Mr. Clay *fear* that I had acted *even* indiscreetly? Because he formed his opinion from information communicated to him by Judge Wooley, and

his possession which, it was intimated, if published would seriously injure me, he would not use or suffer it to be used against me, and also to deter or persuade me from being severe upon him in my forthcoming *Appeal*. How far he was successful in the attainment of the former object it would certainly be very presumptuous in me to pretend to say, for John of Roanoke, asserted that there were two things the Almighty himself could not forestall: the verdict of a petty-jury, and the result of an election, and I say there is a third, which is, the transparent deception that Dr. Dudley cannot practice on certain folks in this city, who seem to have an instinctive sense of their inability to think for themselves. His emphatic assurance either in person, or through Peter, or Dr. Bush, for what they say is as certain a forerunner of what he would have the people believe he thinks, as the pilot-fish is of the shark, (but sooner than perform such a function I would

"be a dog and bay the moon."
"I'd rather be a toad
And live in the vapour of a dungeon,"

seems to have the power of the white roses of Alnashar to charm away all uneasiness of thought or reflection; for when he is in trouble or in difficulty, no matter what may be the cause, his tribe of parasites, at his signal, flock around him as by magic, as the Highlanders did at the summons of Roderick Dhu.

In relation to the latter object, however, the speech of Dr. Bush had just no effect at all, for I spoke of Dr. Dudley as freely and as fully, after I heard what he had said, as was my original design. But matters have taken such a turn that the implied pledge of Dr. Bush could not be redeemed. Fighting now with the frantic energy of undisciplined desperation, Dr. Dudley forgetting every sentiment of honor, and acknowledging no obligation of secrecy, even in regard to the most private and confidential transactions, suffers an individual, in whom is mingled every possible variation of raganauism, to publish to the world the letter of his illustrious correspondent. Besides the infamy of the act which cannot fail to challenge attention and provoke censure, it is amusing to contrast the air and manner of the author and that of his automaton. While the former is as mild and apparently as innocent as a "sucking dove," although, in fact, there is more humanity in a vulture, the lugubrious loquacity of the latter reminds me of a squalling and inebriate goose attempting with mighty exertions to get out of a duck-pond, but the more he flaps his wings and flounders about the faster he sticks, and the deeper he sinks.

*The brutal and ungentlemanly billingsgate of Mitchell and Peter, in relation to my use of ardent spirits, is two foul and contemptible a slander to merit a serious notice. They say it was witnessed in the green-room and on the rostrum by the students. To the Alumni and students of the Transylvania Medical School I therefore appeal. By their verdict I will abide. But a few days ago I heard an Alumnus of the School, who had taken, I believe, four or five courses of lectures in it, and two of them before I left it, assert, in the presence of witnesses, that the only Professor that he ever saw disguised by liquor, on the rostrum, was one of those who signed the letter requesting me to resign. The gentleman to whom I refer has always been regarded as a great admirer and particular friend of Dr. Dudley. While I know that Peter is qualified for any work of infamy I ought not to be surprised that the malignity of Mitchell should cause him to denounce me as an inebriate when he hyena-like pursued the late, lamented Eberle into the grave, declaring with a fiendish delight that he had been exposed to the cross-fire of brandy and opium nearly all his life, and had at last fallen a victim to them.

which he (Judge Wooley) had previously derived from my late colleagues. The following facts establish the truth of this declaration. Judge Wooley tells me in his letter of the 16th July, 1846, that he had "conversations with the Professors." Mr. Clay's letter is dated the 28th of May, 1844, and on that day Judge Wooley had a conversation with Mr. Clay, as he told me himself, and also informed me that he (Mr. Clay) wished to see me at Ashland that evening, at 5 o'clock P. M. Judge Wooley in his "conversations with the Professors" doubtless learned from them their pretended grounds of complaint against me, and these he communicated to Mr. Clay, for the latter in the first sentence of his letter to Dr. Dudley says: "*I have heard to day for the first time, and with the deepest regret of the difficulties which have arisen between the Medical Faculty and Dr. Cross," &c.*" Thus it is perfectly clear that the fear expressed by Mr. Clay was the result of intelligence furnished by my enemies. It was not deduced, as it should have been, from the facts of the case as they actually existed, but from the exaggerations, misrepresentations, and falsifications of those who, like enraged fiends, were seeking my destruction. When the reader reflects upon this fact, so far from being surprised that Mr. Clay should fear I had acted indiscreetly, he will be surprised that he did not have much worse apprehensions.*

*Here I think it proper to remark that, in regard to my conduct, as a man, having rendered me obnoxious to aversion, it is impossible for me to extort from my accusers the assertion of a single fact, and therefore it is utterly impossible for me, on that point, to make a direct defence. In my *Card* of the 28th of August, I challenged Dr. Dudley to take the responsibility of preferring a single charge, and of attempting to establish it by proof. This he has declined absolutely, and he and his associates hope to destroy me by such vague allusions as the following: Dr. Dudley speaks of the "odious stains upon a (my) character;" Mitchell of "the perpetual delinquencies that we were compelled to conceal;" and Peter of the "odium of a crime." This is obviously so inhuman, atrocious, and cruel, especially when it is recollect that I demanded specific allegations, that no one who has not predetermined to aid and abet my enemies in their infernal crusade against me will suffer what they have said to have any weight in enabling them to make up an opinion as to the merits of this controversy. Like the lowest class of lying and irresponsible gossips, whose daily employment, in a little village, is secretly and insidiously to undermine private character by vague but significant hints these men have the impudence to attempt in a written controversy, addressed to the public, to accomplish their nefarious object, in the same way. They should, however, have recollect that the moment they summoned the *press* to aid in the propagation of their slanders, they appealed to the judgments of sensible men, and not to the ignorant prejudices of stupid men, and gossipping women. The former will see, at once, that all the *Trio* have said is malicious *caut*—and *cant* is unanswerable for

"True no meaning puzzles worse than wit."

This is absolutely the case when speaking of my private character, but when arguing another point the "*Statements of Facts*" become, inadvertently, a little more particular, and embody a disclosure that exposes to view the nefarious transaction in a most disgusting light. This disclosure must prove that my late colleagues notwithstanding the ostentatious parade they have made on the subject, had no

This letter of Mr. Clay has a very important bearing on another matter. If the version given of the cause of the request to resign be not a fabrication, why should Mr. Clay address himself to Dr. Dudley instead of the Chairman of the Board of Trustees? Be it recollect that both Mitchell and Peter assert that the suggestion of this letter was a friendly act on the part of Dr. Richardson designed to enable me to escape the disgrace of an expulsion by the Trustees. The difficulty therefore was with the Trustees, and not with the Faculty, and consequently the letter of Mr. Clay should have been addressed to the Chairman of the former, and not to Dr. Dudley. But if "confirmation strong as proof of holy writ" be required by the reader that the statements of Mitchell and Peter in regard to the source and cause of the letter of requisition are false, he will find it in the second letter addressed to me by the Faculty, in which the Dean says "I am authorized to request that you will make known your decision in the premises by Thursday at noon, of this week, in default of which it will be their duty to lay the matter before the Board of Trustees." In their Statements they tell the public it was wished that I should escape the disgrace of an expulsion by the Trustees, but in their second letter they threaten to hurry me before

just ground of complaint against me, but had decided right or wrong, on my sacrifice "for no other reason," as I have stated in my *Appeal*, than because I had resolved no longer to be associated with such men." The blundering Peter in his superservicable zeal to convict me of expulsion says: "The note requesting him to resign was written by myself and submitted, and was amended by Dr. Richardson by the addition of the words 'touching your private character.'" The reader will remark this amendment which, however, Peter in his precipitancy, and he reminds me, if little things may be compared to great, of Bunyan's giant Pope—"biting his nails that he cannot come at me," has quoted incorrectly, for it is "relating to" and not "touching," as he has it. Now how would the note read without the amendment ascribed to Dr. Richardson? Infinitely more vaguely and ridiculously than it does at present. But for Dr. R. it would have read thus: "Circumstances having occurred which will hereafter prevent us." Had this continued to be the wording of the note who on earth could have clearly understood what was meant? To request me to resign without assigning some reason was very preposterous, and yet this was exactly what they were about to do. If any good reason had existed for such a procedure it is utterly impossible to believe that it would not have been the leading idea in the letter of requisition. According to Peter there was not the vaguest sort of allusion to any impropriety of conduct on my part—no charge whatever was preferred in the original draught of that letter, and for the obvious reason they had no just ground of complaint—they had it not in their power to bring a specific allegation against me. This appeared to Dr. Richardson, if Peter tells the truth, too palpably unprincipled, too outrageously absurd, and therefore he trumped up, on the spot, the general accusation against my private character. This was consequently an after thought. They decided to sacrifice me, and this they at first intended to do without assigning a reason for it, but afterwards found it necessary to fabricate some justification of their conduct. There is no cause to believe that his accomplices were more conscientious than Dr. Dudley himself, and he has admitted that he had no reason whatever to urge in excuse or palliation of his conduct. Was there ever so gross and shameless an exhibition of incurable ignorance, unblushing impudence, and undisguised profligacy?

that body even before I had had time to consult with my friends, or to ascertain the specific grounds of complaint against me.

"False, false, false!
Let all untruths stand by thy stained name,
And they'll seem glorious."

Decidedly as I am of opinion that my character and standing do not depend on the breath of any man's nostrils, however distinguished, I cannot in justice to myself, from motives of delicacy, as the *Trio* have appealed to Mr. Clay's name against me, refrain from giving the public the following letter:

ASHLAND, Sept. 20th, 1844.

MY DEAR SIR: Dr. Cross who may present you this letter, being about to visit Abingdon, where you are expected to be, *I take pleasure in introducing him to your acquaintance as a gentleman of fine genius and great respectability and ability*, residing in Lexington. The Doctor has done much good service in the Whig cause, and the desire of rendering it still more has prompted his present tour.

I received your letter from Baltimore, and was extremely sorry to hear of the indisposition of Miss Preston. I sincerely hope that she may be recovered, and that Providence may spare her to you. My warm regards to Mrs. Preston and to her.

I am faithfully, your friend,
H. CLAY.*

W. C. PRESTON Esq.

This was a spontaneous, free will offering of Mr. Clay, and for the simple reason that it was altogether unnecessary, and I told him so at the time. That such was the fact, the following facts will prove. I had received a letter signed by the Hon. Wyndham Robinson, Ex. Governor Cambell and a brother of the Hon. Wm. C. Preston, whose christian name I do not now recollect, formally inviting me to attend and address the people, at the great Convention to be held at Abingdon, Virginia, on the 7th of October 1844; and I was already acquainted with the Hon. W. C. Preston, and had been since April 1834. In proof of this, I have now in my possession two letters of introduction, which several friends have seen, bearing the sign-manuel of that distinguished man. One of them is to General Lafayette, and the other to the late, lamented Hugh S. Legare, who was at the time our Charge d'Affairs at Brussels.

In the concluding paragraph of the first edition of my *Appeal*, I say, "Having now laid before the reader a broad and inexpungable phalanx of facts, which go irresistibly to establish the position, that a conspiracy was formed for my destruction, of which Dr. Dudley was the leader, I will not insult his

understanding, or offend his sensibilities, by indulging in vulgar and vituperative comments upon the conduct of those who banded together for my ruin." I believe in my *Appeal* I made an argument in support of the above declaration, which no candid or honest mind could possibly resist. In this judgement I am supported by some of the most acute and accomplished men in the country, and yet that argument was not perfect. This, from the very nature of things, it was impossible for me to make it, but Peter, by an unintentional and indiscreet admission, has rendered it so. It was very important to the perfection of my argument that I should be able to prove that the letter requesting me to resign, was written after the interview I had with Mitchell and Dr. Richardson on Saturday the 25th May 1844. This I could not positively prove, but succeeded in making that inference almost, if not quite, irresistible. Now, however, there is no doubt on the subject, for Peter has unwittingly testified to the fact. The reader will please refer to the account I have given at page 18 of my *Appeal*, of the conversation above alluded to, the truth of which, the *Trio* have not impugned or denied, and then connect it with the following precious confession of Peter. In a note page 14 of "*Statements of Facts*," after an absurd and impracticable attempt to convict me of falsehood, for I defy any man on earth to tell what he means, and I cannot account for its introduction, unless Providence designed to give, in him, another illustration of the fact, that the false and treacherous are not allowed to be faithful, even to their own villainies, says: "Now this conversation (that of Mitchell, Dr. Richardson and myself, on Saturday the 25th May, 1844,) took place not more than fifteen minutes before the request was penned." The whole note from which the above confession is extracted, was evidently, like the shaft of Acestes, shot into void air without an aim, unless Providence designed that I should have an opportunity of dispelling every shadow of doubt in relation to the infamous conspiracy which had been plotted for my destruction.

The reader will recollect, as I have already requested him, that in the "*Statements of Facts*" the *Trio* have not questioned the truth of my account of my conversation with Mitchell and Dr. Richardson or of the circumstances attending it, and I state that when I entered the Faculty room, and remarked that I wished to speak to Mitchell and Dr. Richardson, Peter retired—that Mitchell, Dr. Richardson and myself left the Medical College together—that I met Dr. Dudley on the sidewalk between the Medical College and my house, and that fifteen minutes after all this, Peter says, the letter of requisition was penned. Truly, they must have re-assembled speedily and have despatched business with telegraphic rapidity. And truly I may say with Peter, "that liars have need

*This letter is in my possession, because, Col. Preston was not at Abingdon.

of memories"** There is now no longer any doubt on the subject—the world now knows almost to a minute, and under what circumstances precisely, Mitchell, Peter, Drs. Dudley and Richardson determined upon my destruction. My feelings of gratitude for this confession of the dirty little Englishman, Peter, are such, that he may rest assured that should I, in future, believe that malignant stupidity can be of any service to me whatever, he may look with perfect confidence for a job.

The refutation of the charges preferred against me, in connexion with the session of 1837-'38, is so full and satisfactory, that I might with propriety dispense with noticing those in regard to my alleged conduct towards Professors Smith and Bartlett, for it is impossible for either of those individuals to believe that they have any foundation in truth. A brief explanation however, may not be wholly unnecessary, so far at least, as the public is concerned. I deny positively, that I ever spoke disrespectfully of Professor Smith or of his teachings. Whatever my slanderers may say to the contrary, I now assert that his deportment as a man, commanded my respect, and his course of instruction had my approbation; and I feel assured that he will say, so far as he could judge from my conduct towards him, that this was the fact.—I admit, however, that I understood he did complain of me, but it was on different grounds altogether. To render myself more useful to the Class, besides my public course on the Institutes, I commenced a gratuitous private course on Therapeutics. This I believe gave Professor Smith dissatisfaction, but no sooner was it communicated to me by Dr. Richardson, than I at once, and without hesitation, discontinued it. Never did this circumstance, so far as I am informed on the subject, give rise to the slightest personal dissatisfaction on the part of Dr. Smith, and I am certain that my conduct towards him ever afterwards, was such as to assure him that his objecting to the course on Therapeutics gave me no offence.

That Professor Bartlett threatened to leave the School on account of my denunciations of him I believe to be utterly false, for in the "Statements of Facts"† I find the very first intimation of it that I ever received on the subject. That efforts were made immediately after Prof. Bartlett came into the School to prejudice him against me I am well aware, for he told me so himself, but he would not

inform me by whom. Finding, however, that my conduct towards him was anything but what he had been taught to expect, rather an intimate and a confidential friendship was soon established between us. That I respected him as a man and confided in him as a physician, I gave the most conclusive proof. Never have I spoken of him as a man of erudition and talents in other than terms of unstinted admiration, while the fact that, when he was in Lexington, he was always my family physician, proves the value I placed upon his professional knowledge. Nor did this commend me (as Dr. Bartlett knows well) to the good will of my colleagues. They regarded the preference I gave him, after a brief acquaintance, not only a reproach but a palpable insult. This was the case with Mitchell, and Dr. Richardson, in particular, for they were not ignorant of the influence which the fact of my employing Dr. Bartlett would have not only with the people but the physicians of Lexington. That Prof. Bartlett ever had just ground to complain or that he ever did complain of me, I do not believe, and nothing less than his own assertion of the fact will convince me of it. Were I disposed I might say much of the scandalous manner in which he was denounced by some of his present colleagues immediately after his resignation in 1844, and of the bad feeling that grew out of my defence of him against their unfounded allegations. As very extraordinary pains have been taken in the "Statements of Facts" to misrepresent the terms upon which I lived with my colleagues, I appeal with perfect confidence to my colleagues in the Medical College of Ohio for a refutation of the slander. During the two years I served in that Institution the relations that subsisted between them and myself were of the most friendly character. The separation I have every reason to believe was mutually regretted; it certainly was on my part and no doubt will continue to be a subject of repentance as long as I live. Even in the Transylvania Medical School the relations that subsisted between my colleagues and myself have been most grossly misrepresented. One would suppose from the statements of the *Trio* that I was constantly involving myself in squabbles and difficulties with them. If so, this would necessarily have produced an estrangement that must occasionally have ended in, at least, a temporary suspension of all sort of courtesy and civility. Now, what was the fact? Never from the moment I entered the Institution until I finally left it, did I ever meet a colleague, either in private or in public, that he did not greet me with the usual compunctions. Never had I a personal quarrel with a colleague in my life unless the difficulties of the session of 1841-'42 should be thus denominated. I did not like Dr. Dudley and my love for Peter was not very great, yet the feelings of hostility mutually experienced, never went so far as to occasion an open rupture. The business of the Faculty was not at any time interrupted on account of it. Though we disliked one another with a rancorous and unforgiving animosity, our intercourse even to the last was courteous, but of a most forbidding and repulsive character. I was seven years a Professor in the Transylvania Medical School, and during six of those, Professors Smith and Bartlett together were my colleagues, and to them I appeal with confidence for a full ratification of

*The confession of Peter strengthens, if it does not establish, the truth of a conjecture I have always entertained, i. e., that the letter requesting me to resign, was written in Dr. Dudley's office, and not in the Faculty room. The following are my reasons for thinking so; Peter had left the Medical College, and I have no doubt went home which is not far from Dr. Dudley's office—Mitchell and Richardson hurried to his office to inform him that I would resign immediately, and that something must be done, *instanter*, to prevent the exposures I had threatened to make. They did not find Dr. Dudley at home, but he not being more than one hundred and fifty yards in their rear, reached there no doubt by the time they had ascertained that fact. Peter was sent for, and the letter was written. If the reader requires further proof of the summary proceeding by which I was sacrificed, he will find it in the closing paragraph of Dr. Dudley's statement, (see p 9,) upon which I will take occasion before this *Analysis and Refutation* closes, to comment.

the truth of what I have above said on the subject of my relations with my associates.

Whatever may be asserted of the irritability of my temper, never did a man, considering the circumstances in which I was placed, keep his feelings under more complete stoical subjection. I had but one ambition, one desire to gratify, and that was to see the Medical Department of Transylvania University flourish. But every effort that I made to place its future prospects on a sure and stable foundation was opposed and defeated by those who did not differ with me in opinion, but who were paralysed by the fear of incurring the displeasure of Dr. Dudley, who, so far as I could judge, seemed to have no other ambition than to keep those around him who would flatter him and fawn on him, but who were too ignorant and too stupid ever to become his rivals for popular favor.

Two things were absolutely indispensable to the permanent success of the Medical School of Transylvania. The first was that the Chair of Theory and Practice, incontestably the most important and therefore the best calculated, if properly filled, to give a School of Medicine reputation, should be given to an able and a popular man, and one who would remain permanently its incumbent. Since the foundation of the School the Board of Trustees had been required no less than eight times to fill it, and for this reason, more than any other, the Institution had not been allowed to acquire any permanent character for the *Principles and Practice* taught in it, or any abiding influence over the practice of medicine in the West and South. Look at the reputation which other Schools have acquired almost exclusively on account of the teachings of this Chair, and no one will doubt the soundness or the wisdom of my policy. Mainly because of the frequent changes in the Professor of Theory and Practice, the Chair of Surgery acquired an importance in the Transylvania Medical School to which it is not entitled, from its intrinsic utility to the practitioner, and which it never enjoyed in any great School in Europe or the U. States. This I wished, for this and an other reason, to have corrected, and this could only have been done by an able and a popular man in the Chair of Theory and Practice who would remain permanently with us. The other reason for ardently desiring what I have just suggested consisted in the fact that it was said and believed the very existence of the School was in the breath of Dr. Dudley's nostrils. Without impairing his reputation, if he had been an honest or a reasonable man this opinion could and should have been corrected. He is advanced in years, further than is good for his soul or body, and his death at any time would be a subject of but little surprise, and, if he were properly understood, of still less regret, and when it does happen, or if it had happened within the last 15 years, who is in it or who has been in it during that time from the comparatively subordinate stations they were obliged to occupy that could have saved the School from irretrievable ruin? His colleagues were mere subalterns—his name overshadowing the whole Faculty. The necessity for a man not advanced in years in the Chair of Theory and Practice, who would identify himself with the *Principles and Practice of Physic* in the West and

South, was self-evident. This would have made the School independent of Dr. Dudley or any other individual—his death or resignation would not have then materially affected its prospects. The wisdom of this policy was not seen—at all events it was not acted on, and now it is too late. To flatter the vanity of a very inferior man the School has been sacrificed. Indeed the course of policy pursued by Dr. Dudley was obviously of so ruinous a character that I believed he desired (and this opinion I expressed to some of my colleagues) to bring the School into such a condition that his death or resignation would forever seal its doom. The second was that we should have, if possible, an abler Faculty than could be found in either Louisville or Cincinnati. The indispensability of this resulted from the fact that, the Schools in those cities enjoy fundamental advantages which that in Lexington does not possess and never will. In Louisville and Cincinnati they have hospitals and an abundance of subjects for dissection—in this city there is neither. If these incontestable and great advantages would be counterbalanced, it was obvious enough that it could be done only in one way, and that very imperfectly, which was to present an abler Faculty, if possible, than could be found either in Louisville or Cincinnati. Some of my colleagues agreed with me, but instead of doing what they, by firmness and consistency were perfectly able to do towards strengthening the Faculty, preferred, like mean and dastardly cowards, as they are, (and this is the least of their infirmities,) to truckle to Dr. Dudley, and aid in collecting around him an obsequious tribe of contemptible parasites who would be scorched into a cinder by the sun of sense or science were they to venture beyond the boundaries of his shadow and expose themselves to its rays. While they are fast they may feed, (to fatten is now impossible,) but when, by death or resignation, he leaves the School, (and the latter event, we are told, is to take place next spring,) they must perish; and Lexington will have the glorious satisfaction of knowing that it stood silently by, with folded arms, and saw every man who was capable of making it a respectable School of medical instruction sacrificed on the altar of Dr. Dudley's vengeance. The day is to come, and it is not far distant when his name is to become with the whole population a by-word and a reproach—as it is already with every thinking and independent man in this city.

Besides one charge that I shall be obliged to notice fully, there is a host of microscopic imputations thrown upon me by the authors of the "Statements" which I cannot entirely neglect—yet in the attempt to wipe them off, I fear I shall offend the readers of this publication by my condescension, as much as those were disgusted who perused what is said in relation to them in the "Statements." For example it is asserted that I often talked of leaving the School, and that, when Prof. Eberle died, I threatened to do so, if I was not appointed his successor. This is false, for I never made such an intimation except in the springs of '42 and '44. Now what are the facts? Upon the death of Dr. Eberle, which took place in the winter, Mitchell nominated himself for the vacant Chair. The ensuing spring he was still resolved to be the successor of Dr. Eberle, although he received no encouragement from any quarter, and became so refrac-

tory that Dr. Dudley, irritated at his pertinacity, remarked to me, "We must get rid of him." We had already lost two professors, and, having no desire to see a third Chair vacated by such harsh means, I proposed to Dr. D., and afterwards to Dr. Richardson, that we, to satisfy and quiet Mitchell, had better transfer him to *Materia Medica*, and that, as he fancied he would be of *immense importance* to the School, if in a practical Chair, that we add *Therapeutics* to it. To gild the pill, for Dr. Dudley did not like him, I suggested that such an arrangement would probably enable Peter to reach the Chemical Chair. Dr. Dudley at once acceded to the proposition—the transfer was made, and Mitchell was silenced. I solemnly aver that I am the author of the project to transfer Mitchell to *Materia Medica*, and to give him, in addition, *Therapeutics*. Before 1838 the Chair was entitled *Materia Medica* and *Medical Botany*—ever since that time, *Materia Medica* and *Therapeutics*.*

One of the Trio makes the ridiculous assertion, that before the appointment of Dr. Bartlett, I persecuted him with my pretensions to the vacant Chair of Theory and Practice. This is impossible, for I am very sure I did not speak to the individual who made the above observation, from the time Dr. Smith resigned, until several weeks after Dr. Bartlett was elected, and the facts will sustain me in this allegation. Dr. Smith resigned immediately after Commencement, and I went to New Orleans and St. Louis, and was absent six weeks,

*Here is another illustration of the extent to which I was capable of sacrificing my personal feelings to promote the interests of the School. Notwithstanding Peter called on me several times after I settled in Lexington in 1837 and endeavored to make himself as amiable as possible by apologizing in the most submissive terms for his conduct in 1834 to which he now insolently refers, and begged me to forget it, I determined, if possible, to prevent his election to the Chemical Chair, and, in conjunction with Dr. Richardson, succeeded. In the spring of 1838 circumstances had changed. The School was in a very precarious state; we had lost, as I have stated, two Professors—Mitchell was disposed to multiply instead of remove difficulties—I felt it important that the Faculty should present an unbroken front as speedily as possible, and therefore suggested to Dr. Dudley the project above referred to. Nothing but the emergencies of the School could ever have persuaded me to submit to become the colleague of Peter, and very frequently afterwards I was deservedly reproved by Mitchell, Drs. Richardson and Bush for the agency I had in the matter. They threw the whole blame upon me, and justly, saying that, had I not have united with Dr. Dudley on Peter, they could have procured Dr. Bird, of Philadelphia, which, I believe, was the fact. But I was governed by the desire not to suffer the idea to go abroad that the Faculty was in a state verging on disorganization, and therefore acted perhaps too precipitately. Never, without my consent, could Peter have been a member of the Faculty, for both Mitchell and Dr. Richardson were irreconcilably opposed to him. When I say that I agreed to the elevation of Peter for the sake of the School, the reader will not be surprised that I was opposed to the adoption of such measures as would have probably driven Dr. Dudley out of it, although I hated him. The prosperity of the Institution was always uppermost in my mind, and the gratification of any feeling, whether of personal like or dislike, was never suffered to interfere with it, and had Dr. Dudley been prompted by the same motives, the Transylvania Medical School would now be in a flourishing condition. But his unconquerable and irrepressible propensity to engage in some vile stratagem to injure or destroy his colleagues, like the wrath of Achilles has brought upon the Institution innumerable calamities. In this unruly passion is to be found the mournful Iliad of Transylvania's misfortunes, for being sleeplessly vigilant, it caused him, like Virgil-Harpies, to spoil whatever he touched.

I remained at home not more than a week, when I set out for Philadelphia, and did not return until the middle of June, two weeks after the election of Dr. Bartlett. If, therefore, I persecuted the little man in relation to the Chair of Theory and Practice, it must have been done at a very respectful distance,

Mitchell most stupidly remarks:—"He feared as a consequence of his misconduct, that the Chair of the Institutes would be vacated, and intimated as much to the late Dr. Richardson, as a reason why he desired the Chair of Theory and Practice." Did mortal man ever see so gross a specimen of transparent nonsense, or were ever men reduced to such desperate straits to find excuses for their infamous conduct? If I dreaded what is here alleged, how could this manoeuvre have saved me? Would not my misconduct have caused the Chair of Theory and Practice, even after my transfer to it, to be vacated as readily as that of the Institutes? Undoubtedly, and in this view of the subject, which is the only rationally one that can be taken, like the ghosts of Ossian, the force of his argument vanishes.

"Often and again," says Mitchell, "did we wish him out of the School." Why then did Professors Richardson and Bartlett interpose to prevent my resignation in 1842? Besides, it is in my power to prove that, in December 1844, at the Funeral of my then, last and only child, when it was feared my bereavements, which had been numerous and severe, would extinguish in me all interest in Medical Schools, or indeed, in any thing else, Dr. Richardson, unawed by the solemnity of the occasion, asked an individual who he thought might know, if I intended to resign, and added, that if I entertained any such purpose it must be prevented, for it would ruin the School. Let me remind Mitchell when he speaks so glibly of having wished me out of the School, that I more than once saved him from the vengeance of those who will yet sacrifice him.*

Mitchell asks:—"Was not that *gentleman* (he means Peter, but if he had not given us his name, I should never have suspected to whom he alluded) on the eve of bringing that man before the Trustees for his scandalous interference with, and depreciation of the Chemical Chair?" To which I answer, yes; but what was this "*scandalous interference*?" The republication in the *Western and Southern Medical Recorder*, of which I was the editor of an article from the *London Medical Gazette*, in which the necessity and importance of a Chair of Chemistry in a School of Medicine was questioned if not denied. Peter was afraid that if I

*It is a gross offence against the peace and pleasure of social intercourse, to be guilty of retailing gossip or scandal, but as he is perfectly notorious for it, and on this account, as "much as any thing else, has become odious, he will not be shocked when I tell him there are those of his colleagues and have been ever since the first session he served in the School, "who wish him out of it." Since I left it, if I have been correctly informed, and of this I have no doubt, Dr. Dudley denounced him as the first individual who lead the Faculty into the difficulties of the Spring of 1844, and the first cowardly scoundrel who backed out when danger impended, or in other words, when he began to fear he would be turned out. Even within the last six weeks, an individual who knows the sentiments and feelings of his colleagues, emphatically declared that so long as he was in it, he would be involving the School in difficulties. Be ready to walk it Sir, for the plank is being prepared for you.

was permitted to enlighten the public mind on the subject, his chair would be not only vacated but abrogated. The perade, however, that the fussy little creature made about it, was ridiculous and contemptible, and this Mitchell and others thought and asserted at the time.

Mitchell, who has no more bowels than a bear, and but little more brains than an ass, says that my Appeal "was really gotten up, not merely as an attack on Transylvania, but as an electioneering document to help the fortunes of a new Medical School." The man who makes this assertion, knows perfectly well that it was gotten up, to speak in his own coarse language, to defend my character against assaults made upon it by himself, while I was in Europe. So untrue is his allegation, that the necessity I was under to make an Appeal, constituted the principal reason why I doubted the propriety of accepting a situation in the School to which he refers, and why, also, I did not decide to do so until the 12th of August, two months after it had been offered to me.

They say they knew nothing of my intention to resign, although fully aware that Dr. Darby told Dr. Richardson, and Dr. Lewis, Mitchell, that they believed such was my determination. (See p. 23-24 of my Appeal.) Mitchell boasts that in 1838 I eulogised his "moral character." This I do not believe, as I have no recollection of it. But if I did, he has given abundant proof that it was without authority. The people need not be alarmed at the bluster he makes on this subject, for there is not the least danger that the world will be turned up side down by this moral Archimedes, unless lying should become a cardinal virtue. Peter speaks of Cross's specific for *Gonorrhœa*—there is no such medicine of which I have any knowledge. But all this and much more, to be found in the "*Statements of Facts*," is mere twaddle, which no man of character would acknowledge himself to be the author of, for any consideration.

I have already intimated, there is yet one topic upon which I have not dwelt, that seems entitled to some consideration. In the "*Statements of Facts*" it is remarked:—"In his atrocious pamphlet, he has thought proper to throw the odium of his expulsion upon Dr. Dudley, against whom the vial of his gall is more especially poured out: but he better than any one, knows that Dr. Dudley has never given him any particular cause of offence, and that he has no cause of quarrel with him more than with any of his late colleagues."—Peter, although as true to Dr. Dudley as the magnetic needle is to the pole, and although the former stands to the latter, but not vice versa, in the relation that the waters of the Alpheus and Aratus did to one another, for nothing was thrown into the one without being seen very shortly afterwards floating upon the other, cannot be permitted to obtrude his sneaking and disgusting form between my bitter foe and myself—he cannot by so shallow a trick be suffered to shift the *onus probandi* in this dispute. As well might the tiger attempt to unlock the curl of the Boa, as for this Pylades—this Pytheas—this second self of Dr. Dudley, think by his senseless howlings—his gloomy attempts at being facetious, or his frivolous, meaningless and absurd calumnies to pro-

voke me to unfasten my hold upon his master for the purpose of giving him notoriety. He has more than once endeavored to emerge from obscurity by a similar manœuvre, but he has always been foiled and defeated, and such shall be his fate now. Could he involve himself in a quarrel with a man of any consequence in the profession, he would think his fortune was made, and like the Sythian Abaris when wounded by Appollo, heedless of the pain and the disgrace of the wound, plucked the arrow from his side and exclaimed in triumph, that the weapon in future would enable him to deliver oracles. The little Tencer may, if it be a means of gratifying his malignancy, skulk behind the shield of his Ajax Telemon and fire his darts at me, but he will only have his trouble for his pains, for like the javelin of Priam, they will fall harmless at my feet. Were I however in a fit of indiscretion, *no matter from what cause*, to gratify the vanity of this little compound of repugnance, prejudice and disgust, by magnifying him into an object of sufficient importance for serious or special notice, the notoriety he would gain would be nothing more than a temporary phosphorescence, like that which surrounds a decomposing carcass in the dark, that is dispelled by the first beams of the rising sun, and exposes to view the disgusting source of the mephitic radiance." No, I cannot,

*When Peter reflects that I know how he fawned and cringed, and meanly acted the beggar in 1837, and then looks upon the following picture which every artist will recognize as his, and pointed to the lie, he will himself confess that it would be too great a degradation to attempt to disturb the equanimity of his sweet temper.

"Dr. Peter is the pitiful tool of Dr. Dudley, as such, he figured some years ago in assailing the *private* and professional characters of the professors who left Lexington, to establish a Medical School in this city. Dr. Dudley found his services invaluable on that occasion.—Falsehoods and slanders, which Dr. D. was ashamed to publish himself, were farthered and circulated by this hireling, with the greatest alacrity. The fellow proved himself to be as unscrupulous as he was servile. He stuck at nothing. No falsehood gave him a qualm, whether he uttered it, or was compelled to retract it.—He published his lies and his recantations of them, when fear obliged him to take them back, with equal coolness. When Dr. Short forced him to withdraw one which he had put forth on Dr. S.'s alleged authority, he went about it with all the composure of a veteran to gurzeling his mint-sling. His reward for his mendacity was a Professor's Chair in the School by the side of his master. Dr. Dudley could not do less for him. As Dr. D. was afraid to trust his own feeble pen upon paper, his creature had performed a task for him to which few men could be found base enough to stoop. No one believed him fit for the place, but he had brought Dr. Dudley under obligations which nothing but a Chair in the School could satisfy. It is true, that, in addition to this private claim upon Dr. Dudley's gratitude, Dr. Peter preferred the strong public one of having been a vender of quack medicines. These secured him the place which he now disgraces, and where one cannot see him without being reminded of certain parasites, described by entomologists, which are found sticking to the bodies of large animals. He is the laughing-stock of his pupils, and an object at which all sensible and honorable men instinctively point the finger of scorn. He holds his office at the mercy of Dr. Dudley, whose smile he courts with more than a lover's assiduity. His sycophancy knows no bounds. In this respect we can think of none who approaches him, unless it be John Jones of the Madisonian, and he does it by flying to rhyme. The court-fool deals in poetry, while the Lexington driveller writes in unadorned prose. Dr. Peter's adulation is essentially and excessively prosaic; he scorns the graces of art, and is anxious only to bespatter his master with sufficient praise. And this is the creature who undertakes to read lectures to gentlemen on "dignity." His charge against the Pro-

and will not, be diverted from my purpose by such men as either Peter or Mitchell, for I look upon them as nothing more than two Tom-tits twittering upon an Eagle's back, or, perhaps, it would be more proper to say, that Dr. Dudley stands reeling in the "Statements of Facts," between two insignificant characters, like a common noun between two contemptible and conflicting adjectives.

As it has been denied let us see whether or not I have any "particular cause of offence" against their master. Was not his faithless conduct in attempting to defeat my election after he had formally tendered me the chair of Institutes a "particular cause of offence?" Was not his letter addressed to me at Cincinnati a fraudulent attempt to deceive me into the belief that he had redeemed the pledge voluntarily made to me in the conferences I held with him, first in the presence of Dr. Holland, and afterwards in conjunction with Dr. Richardson, in Keizer's Hotel, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact, perfectly notorious to every class, that he arrayed his private pupils against me, and through them endeavored to injure my character and standing with the students, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact that his covert hostility to me became so rancorous and deadly that he set one of his private pupils, an individual whom I had not injured or insulted, upon me in the street, immediately after I had left the rostrum, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact that after the commission of this outrage the identical men who joined him in requesting me to resign were induced by him to withhold from me all justice until it was extorted by the indignant remonstrances of the class, a "particular cause of offence?" Was

not the fact that after debauching three of his colleagues from their duty, he harangued the students from the rostrum, and vainly attempted to set them against me, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact that he has never failed, when he had an opportunity, to poison the mind of every stranger who came to this city against me, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact that ever since I settled in Lexington he has kept the arrows of envy, hatred, and malice, flying in showers around me until he seriously affected my standing, and grievously interfered with my peace, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact that for the purpose of diverting public attention from his own debauched morals, he kept his tribe of college parasites constantly busy in the propagation of the most injurious calumnies against me, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not the fact that to screen an infamous person from complete social ostracism, and himself from disgrace, he alleged the certainty of prospective but premature abdominal rotundity as the result of acquaintance with me, a "particular cause of offence?" Was not his suffering the letter requesting me to resign to be addressed to me, a "particular cause of offence?" With these numerous particular causes of offence

"Who that had reason, soul, or sense would bear it?"

On the subject however of this last inquiry I must speak in detail before a response is given. But the reader should in the first place hear what he has said in relation to it himself: "In the last act of the Medical Faculty, preparatory to his removal from the school, I can claim neither *honor* nor *participation*. *Without my knowledge* my colleagues consulted together, and united in sentiment on the necessity of the measure. When the result of their consultation was communicated to me, I need scarcely add, that the measure not only had my approbation, but received my humble, yet firm support." Did a sane man ever make, except under the gallows after having received clerical comfort, so disgraceful and self-condemnatory a confession? Every desert has its oasis—the darkest night has its gleams of star-light—the most abandoned libertine is sometimes moved to pity, and thoughts of repentance, but Dr. Dudley seems not, even occasionally, to feel any remorse of conscience. Without investigating or even asking for the grounds of complaint—without inquiring into the truth or falsehood of the charges, if indeed any were made, which no one believes, the moment he ascertained that Mitchell, Peter, and Dr. Richardson were ready and willing to in-

fessors of the Medical Institute is a grave one. He says they go to the taverns and steam boats to see medical students, and "even animadverted upon the qualifications of the Lexington professors." This is very serious, and we will here do Dr. Peter the justice to say, that we believe he is never guilty of any such indiscretion. His colleagues are much complained of by students who pass through Lexington, on their way to this city, for their annoying civilities and importunities, but we have not heard Dr. Peter charged with any attempts to electoruer with Louisville pupils. His brother professors are too shrewd to let him enter upon that delicate office. They are too well aware of his repulsive tendencies to suffer him to go where students are before they have taken their tickets and engaged lodgings. He is not permitted to show his sly face, or open his stupid mouth, until the class is made secure. He is kept carefully concealed in the darkest corner of his laboratory, until they are obliged to bring him out to deliver his introductory, which is postponed along as possible. Still, he is said to possess certain facilities even in this business of bringing students to that school. Though as great a bungler at telling a lie as at delivering a lecture, he is considered rather expert at fabricating one. It seems native to him. He has the credit of originating many of the falsehoods in relation to the Medical Institute, which swarm along the road, every autumn, from Lexington to the Alabama line." After saying that Dr. Dudley would "be neither coaxed nor scared into giving up one of his chairs," although the school was suffering from his obstinacy, the writer goes on to say:—"Now the improvement we have to suggest in the organization of the Lexington concern, is the substitution of *Faber's court-couch man* for this automaton of Dr. Dudley." As a lecturer, we have no doubt the India-rubber thing would be the more agreeable, and Dr. Dudley could afford to do a little talking through its wind-pipe at half the price they charge for Dr. Peter."

Like Alcibiades, but only in one respect, for it would be foul calumny to attempt to run a parallel between them, who cut off the luxuriant tail of a most beautiful dog that all Athens admired, to draw off attention from his more disreputable infamies, Dr. Dudley believed that while he could keep the public mind engrossed with the injurious gossip, he and his minions had sent abroad on the wings of rumor against me, it would hardly condescend to think of him or his iniquitous doings. Like the jewels of an ugly dowager that kindly diverts attention from the inspection of her face, he hoped to convert the fashionable follies of a man fond of society into such odious vices that the public criticism would be lured from a strict scrutiny into his own gross moral delinquencies.

sult and disgrace me, it "not only had his approbation, but received his humble, yet firm support." An honest, a generous, or a magnanimous foe would not have treated his deadliest enemy with such injustice and inhumanity, while the greatest scoundrel that ever disgraced his race, so far from boasting of it, would have been almost ashamed to have made the profligate confession even to a priest. In speaking of his participation in this last act, as he calls it, of the Medical Faculty, he has furnished an example of the most astonishing effort of unflinching assurance that the world ever witnessed. During the reign of terror, even those revolutionary butchers, who flooded France with blood, thought it necessary to plead the existence of proofs of guilt against their victims in defence or extenuation of their sanguinary conduct, but Dr. Dudley more remorseless makes, without the least hesitation, the bold and atrocious declaration that he gave his "firm support" to the sacrifice of a man without knowing why or wherefore, except that he hated him. Had no other "particular cause of offence" existed, this confession of Dr. Dudley not only justifies all that I have already said of him, but fully authorizes me to pour upon his devoted head all the bitterness and vindictiveness of my nature. His colleagues might have thought they had some shadow of excuse for their conduct in the idle and ridiculous gossip set afloat in the community by the satellites of Dr. Dudley, but he, according to his own statement, had none whatever, for he has the audacity to inform the public that when the *result*, not the means, by which his colleagues had arrived at it, was *communicated to him*, he, with the utmost cheerfulness, signed the insulting letter in which I was requested to resign.* Further proof surely cannot be required to establish the fact that Dr. Dudley was so anxious for my dishonor and disgrace that he was ready and willing to resort to any means fair or foul, honorable or dishonorable, to accomplish it. That such was the state of his feelings towards me for five years before I left the Institution, I did not doubt, but low as he had sunk in my estimation—deep and abiding as was the contempt I felt for him—bitter and rancorous as was the hate which his dark and treacherous conduct had implanted in my breast, I did not believe he could so far forget those motives of policy, which throughout his whole life have regulated his conduct, as to venture upon the above heartless declaration. What respect, I ask, can such a man have for the public intelligence—or confidence in the public judgment—or regard for the public honor—or sympathy with the public sensibility? I will not pretend to say, for I do not know, and I would rather undertake to discover the philosopher's

stone or find out the squaring of the circle than attempt even to conjecture the black depravity of his feelings—the unutterable atrocity of his thoughts, or the hopeless baseness of the motives by which he is actuated. The Spartans believed that the crime was in the detection and not in the depredation—but Dr. Dudley not satisfied with the perpetration of every outrage that can disgrace humanity, has the shameless audacity to publish his own infamy. What hope is there of the reformation of such a man? Is he one of God's creatures who can be humanised by philosophy, or reclaimed by religion, or converted by any sort of miracle? I think not. You might as well cram food down the gullet of a Farnese Hercules which has no apparatus to digest it, as expect to regenerate Dr. Dudley by such means, for he has less conscience than a French financier. For truth and candor, and justice, he has no more use than a ghost has for a lantern, and any effort to change his nature or ameliorate his conduct, would be like sinners attempting to draw water from the wells of Jacob, for they would only reap the toil. Having lead a life of the most stubborn infidelity, habit has so confirmed his bad principles, and strengthened his vicious propensities, that you might as well extol the charms of a beauty to a eunuch, or "forbid the sea to obey the moon," as think of awakening his impenetrable and selfish heart to a sense of its deep and desperate depravity by holding out to him a hope of a bright and glorious immortality beyond the grave.*

* The reader may think me unjustifyably severe, but he would not be of that opinion had he suffered what I have at his hands. Hear what a man said of him in 1837 who had been his colleague and had known him intimately for nearly twenty years:

"I have written nothing for the *sake of vengeance* Far from it. My object has been to teach, *by truth*, a profitable lesson to those who trade in falsehood and defamation. *And such is Dr. Dudley.* Scandal of some sort is his "heart's delight;" and he sips it in and pours it out with the deep *gusto* of the *savage* at his "fire-water," or the ravening tiger at his banquet of blood. Even in Lexington, *his social paradise*, there are few persons whom he does not, in his moments of fitfulness, abuse and calumniate. This I know to be true, because I have witnessed it. Yet the last word of censure has scarcely escaped him, when, if he meets the subject of it, he takes him by the hand, smirks and smiles in his face, locks arms with him, and, as he walks along the street, whispers something bland and friendly in his ear!—or slanders to him the very individual whom he had just regaled with *his own slander*.

"As *his weapons have been falsehood and a language scarcely superior to Billingsgate*, has he a right to expect from me in return anything more than *plain truth*, and *decorous language*? On a spirit so rancorous and ignominious as his, lenity would be thrown away. He would not feel its awakening influence. It is on the head of the benevolent and the magnanimous that *forgiveness of injuries*, or *good in return for evil*, operates like "*coals of fire*," softening their temper, and reforming their conduct. And Dr. Dudley is not of that caste. If he can be reformed at all, it must be by castigation and terror—by the actual application of the scourge, and by being given fully to understand that "*even-handed justice* is almost sure to return the poisoned chalice to the lips of the murderous wretch who has drugged it."

"Let him, however, repent of his malefactions, adhere to truth, abandon duplicity, throw from his lips a slanderous tongue, and lead hereafter a life of *ingenuousness*, and, whether I "forget and forgive" or not, the evening of his days will be not only more commendable and honorable to him but immeasurably more placid and com-

* When I recollect what Dr. Dudley said to me on the 17th of May, 1844, in relation to Dr. Bush, (p. 16 of my *Appeal*.) and compare it with his conduct towards me, as portrayed by himself, as well as with that which has characterized his treacherous deportment towards very many of his other colleagues, I am reminded of Windernostrels in Rabelais, who died ordinarily on windmills, but who was at last miserably choked by a pat of butter swallowed the wrong way at the mouth of a hot oven.

But this Analysis and Refutation must close. It has already encroached too much on the time and indulgence of the reader, while it has been expanded to an extent more than commensurate with the necessities of the case. But before I part with him, let me ask him in all candor and truth, if I have not redeemed my pledge? I said in my *Card* of the 10th of September: "If there is power in truth, or justice in Lexington, I pledge myself to overwhelm the infamous trio, *not by assertion, but by proof*, with confusion and redemptionless disgrace."**

Have I not conclusively proved that the infamous *Trio* have been guilty of the most revolting delinquencies of which unprincipled men are capable, that they are deep, designing, dissembling, hypocrites, and scoundrels? If this be the case of which I think there can now be no doubt, will not every man who has a manly regard for his own character despise them with a vehemence of scorn that will leave no room for pity? As it is impossible for any society to abide such

fortable than have been their morning and meridian. For, assume what calmness and gaiety he may, and make what professions he may of his enjoyment of pleasure, *Dr. Dudley is an unhappy man, because he feels himself a degraded one!* During the mock-trial by the Board of Trustees, a friend of his declared his sufferings to be such that he was 'bleeding at every pore,' and even implored *clemency* towards him from his injured colleagues. And, were the truth known, he is 'bleeding' still. He has no sense of *justice* and of *honorable pride*, else his *conscientiousness* and *self-esteem* are the *curse* of his existence. I would not be the possessor of his solitary thoughts and midnight visions for his *pecuniary possessions four times told!*"

* In this demonstration (for thus I am obliged to denominate it) does not open the eyes of the people of this city to the true character of Dr. Dudley, and cause him to be left alone in his glory. "with none so mean as to do him homage," then they must excuse me for taking the liberty of reminding them of a celebrated interview that once took place between one Polonius and Hamlet, Prince of Denmark:

@

anointed wickedness "if there is power in truth or justice in Lexington," they must for the future, even in this city, be shunned like a pestilence.

"The wounds of honor never close,"

and as the *Trio* have been convicted by proof unchallengably authentic of absolute and glaring contradictions—of the utmost excesses of unbridled malevolence and calumny—of being thoroughly versed in all the menial offices of depravity—of having been actuated by a polity in their conduct towards me, corrupted in all its channels with the foulest venality—and of having been guilty of an infamous trick, for the purpose of silencing and disgracing me, of which the lowest wretch in Newgate would have been ashamed, the world will instinctively exclaim:

"On their own bed of torture let them lie
Fit garbage for the hell-hound infamy!"

LEXINGTON, Sept. 21, 1846.

Hamlet—Do you see yonder cloud,
That's almost in shape of a camel?

Polonius.—By the mass, and 'tis like a camel indeed.

Ham.—Methinks it is like a weasel.

Pol.—It is backed like a weasel.

Ham.—Or, like a whale.

Pol.—Very like a whale.

It is very far from certain, however, even after having gazed upon the festering mass of iniquity I have laid bare, that a particular set of people in Lexington will be ashamed to truckle to and defend Dr. Dudley. Under a false impression in relation to what would prove conducive to the prosperity of this city in general, and the Medical School in particular, there are those who can easily be persuaded that it is still to their interest to sustain and defend him. That such should prove impregnable to my *Appeal* or to this "*Analysis and Refutation*" of the "*Statements of Facts*," is not surprising, for, as Hobbes says, there are many people who would doubt the truth of Euclid's Elements if it was to their interest.

"What damned error, but what some braw
Will bless it."

APPENDIX.

On the 10th of September, I wrote to Dr. Holland and requested him to say whether or not, about the middle of April 1837, I had an interview at his instance, and in his presence, with Dr. Dudley at Keizer's Hotel, and whether or not, on that occasion, Dr. Dudley tendered me the Chair of Institutes &c., in the Medical Department of Transylvania University. To this letter no answer was returned, but on the 27th inst., I saw Dr. Holland as he was going on board the Kentucky steamboat, and extorted from him the following statement—He remarked, “When I saw you in Lexington, immediately after the death of your daughter, you bitterly complained to me of Dr. Richardson's having neglected her, [he, Dr. R., was her physician, originally, and through the greater part of her illness, but abandoned her to go to Cincinnati, to see Dr. Eberle and myself on the subject of taking Chairs in the Transylvania Medical School. Dr. Lewis having been called to see her not more, I believe, than two or three days before her death,] I admonished you to say nothing more on that subject, as I had understood it was intended to offer you the Chair of the Institutes. Supposing Dr. Dudley did not know you were in Lexington—I informed him of the fact, and advised him to see you. He requested me to say to you, that he would be pleased to see you at his house. When this invitation was delivered to you by me, you declined going to his house, but remarked, that you were at Keizer's Hotel, where he could see you if he wished. An interview took place that day, between you and Dr. Dudley, in my presence, at Keizer's Hotel, at which, I distinctly understood him to offer you the Chair of Institutes. After your appointment by the Board of Trustees, I had a conversation with Dr. Pawling, and we both expressed great astonishment, that Dr. Dudley should have attempted to defeat your election.”

This is substantially the statement written out by me from recollection, (See pages 10 and 11) which was in the hands of the compositor, and I believe, set up, before I saw Dr. Holland on the 27th inst. He could not, however, be induced to put his statement in writing, and for particular reasons, was very desirous that I should not say any thing on his authority. But his wishes cannot be gratified, because, his testi-

mony is important, if not indispensable; besides, I do not think he has any right to withhold it. Moreover, two friends who heard read what I have said in this publication, in connexion with the name of Dr. Holland, saw him in Lexington a few days before he came to Louisville, and informed him of what I expected to prove by him. In their letters to me on this subject, they say that he refused to give a written statement, but testified to the truth of what I had recorded from recollection. Without his consent, therefore, I publish the above statement fully satisfied however, that should it ever be indispensably necessary, he will cheerfully confirm it.

September 30th, 1846.

In confirmation of the statement made at pages 17 and 18, in relation to the condition to which the Medical College of Ohio was reduced, by the resignations spoken of, I take the liberty of quoting the following extracts, from the report of Morgan Neville, Esq., President of the Board of Trustees, dated the 11th December, 1837, to the General Assembly of the State of Ohio. “Soon after Professor Locke left the country, Professor Cross resigned. Shortly before the usual period for issuing the annual circular, while Professor Locke was still absent in Europe, Professors Eberle, Smith and Cobb resigned, without previous notice; Drs. Eberle, Cross and Cobb accepting Chairs in Medical Institutions in a neighboring commonwealth. These resignations left the College with but two Professors, Dr. Locke in Europe, in the service of his brethren, and confiding in their support, and Dr. Morehead at home. Left thus in the charge of the College, the Chairs vacated, the session about to commence, and several of the Professors transferred to other and neighboring Institutions, the Trustees doubted their ability to fill the Chairs, and organize a suitable Faculty in time for the usual course of lectures and instruction this season.” In consequence of the facts above stated, the Class of the Medical College of Ohio fell at once, from 178 to 80 students, of whom, three only were from Kentucky. But that Institution, I am gratified to know, has recovered from the distresses of 1837, and now may look forward with confidence, to a bright and prosperous future.

ERRATA.

Page 9, column 1, line 31 from bottom, for *mendicity* read *mendacity*.
Page 10, column 1, line 23 from top, for *was* read *were*.
Page 18, column 2, line 5 from bottom, for *with the* read *without the*.
Page 20, column 1, line 3 from bottom, for *the former* read *him*.
Page 24, column 1 line 31, from bottom, for *not been* read *not have been*.